

—THE—

American Church Review

Vol. XLIV.—No. 155.

OCTOBER, 1884.

ROBERT HARPER CLARKSON, D.D., LL.D.

ROBERT HARPER CLARKSON, D.D., LL.D., was born in Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, November 19th, 1826, was graduated from Pennsylvania College in the same place in 1844, immediately after accepted a tutorship in S. James College, Maryland; while there studied theology, was ordained Deacon June 18th, 1848, Priest, January 5th, 1851, was consecrated Missionary Bishop of Nebraska and Dakota, November 15th, 1865, and died March 10th, 1884, in his 58th year.

Not quite well for some time previous, the Bishop attended a meeting of the Northern Convocation of his Diocese at Grand Island on the 6th, 7th and 8th of February, and among other duties delivered a charge to his Clergy. The weather was snowy, blustering and intensely cold. The few Church people who could entertain did what they could to make the Bishop and Clergy comfortable. Exposure, however, was unavoidable; the worst of it—that which probably caused the Bishop's fatal illness—being at the hotel where he was obliged to wait four hours for a belated train to Omaha—from 12

o'clock midnight until 4 o'clock. The hotel being crowded, the Bishop accepted a cot in the hall, a cold and drafty place, where, except for his great fatigue, he would not have thought of lying down. On the following Sunday, Septuagesima, he preached in his Cathedral and in S. Barnabas, Omaha. Though far from well, he continued to meet his engagements until February 18th, when increasing fever and weakness confined him to his room, which he never left again. From the first he declared that the end was near. All that medical skill and faithful nursing and constant relays of sleepless watchers could do was done. But he grew steadily worse until midnight of March 10th, when painlessly, silently he breathed his last. Those with him during those closing days are at a loss how to convey to others an adequate impression of the calmness, the tenderness, the gentle, yet lofty trustfulness, the sweet, untroubled resignation in that chamber of death. He said over and over that he was not only weary, but worn out; that if it was God's will that he should stay awhile and work on, he was ready, but that it seemed better to him every way that his mantle should pass to younger shoulders, and a fresher life take the place of his. Never did a Bishop enter more entirely into the feeling that his work was God's not his own, and that God would take care of it. There was not a word of mourning over delays and failures in the past. Not a word of anxiety about unfinished plans in the future, though these plans had been the burden of his thoughts for years. It had all been a trust committed to him and he saw it only as something to be handed over to and carried on by others, supremely grateful that he had been allowed to add to it his eighteen years of hard and wasting toil. The last rites over the Bishop were so attended and so conducted as to leave no doubt as to the depth and power of the great sorrow that moved not only the Clergy and Laity of his Diocese, but as well the common heart of his City and State. In every sense they were singularly impressive and in some respects fraught with unspeakable tenderness. The public schools were suspended and their more than four thousand child-

ren lined the streets. The judges of the courts, officers of the United States Army, representatives of all the professions, the Mayor and Common Council, men of every calling and every trade sought places in the procession. All felt, and they desired to show that they so felt, that no one death had ever, in the history of that young State, taken so much virtue and strength out of it. His grave is where himself chose that it should be, under the window of the South transept of the Cathedral, a spot which, as the people themselves, irrespective of religious ties, declare, will be forever consecrated, in their own and their children's memories, as holding the dust of the best Christian and the best citizen of their State.

Standing at the close of such a life, one can scarcely help asking what were the influences, within and without, in early manhood, that gave it the form and direction which it assumed and made it so fruitful in what is most precious to the Church and to the world. To begin with, there was a strong ancestral influence. The Bishop's grandfather, the Rev. Joseph Clarkson, D.D., Rector, for half a lifetime of S. James' Church, Lancaster, Penn., was the first clergyman ordained by Bishop White. The Rev. Dr. Bowman afterward Rector of the same Parish and subsequently Bishop of Pennsylvania, was his uncle. These two near relationships, the one laden with many ecclesiastical memories well calculated to awaken in a young mind the historic instinct and to direct it in Churchly lines; the other charged with the affectionate, sympathetic solicitude of an eminently wise man who lost no opportunity to impress upon his nephew the claims of the Ministry, the honor and dignity as well as the labor and self-sacrifice of serving at God's Altar were, no doubt, decisive, so far as any external influences could be, of young Clarkson's purpose, while he was serving as tutor in S. James' College, to study for Holy Orders. This settled, he passed under the guidance of Dr. Kerfoot, then President of S. James', and subsequently Bishop of Pittsburg, whose positive and energetic character told

powerfully upon all who were brought within the reach of his influence. Dr. Kerfoot's theology and Church views generally were, at that time, as positive and energetic as his personal character. No mist rested on his teaching. No uncertain sound ever fell from his lips. No candidate for Holy Orders that he had any responsibility for could have a moment's doubt as to his ideal of a Priest in the Church of GOD. Into everything he said or did Dr. Kerfoot carried a resolute and unflinching honesty, and, as a rule, the most decided convictions. To one intimate with Clarkson's character, nothing could have seemed more fortunate than this close connection with Dr. Kerfoot in the formative period of his life. Only from such a man could he have learned what he most needed to know; only by such a man could his naturally amiable, self-distrustful disposition have been drawn aside from its spontaneous drift and endowed with the vigorous strength and manly self poise needed for the leadership to which, in after days, he was called. Though he never could bring himself to feel any very deep interest in scientific expositions of the dogmas of theology, yet he was thoroughly rooted and grounded in the dogmas themselves considered as principles of thought and action. This brings me to notice, in its proper historic order and in the quality and reach of its influence, the life-long and loving friendship of Dr. Muhlenberg, certainly to be reckoned among the foremost things that helped to make Bishop Clarkson what he was. When with the Doctor he bore himself almost as a son toward a father, and the feeling was more than reciprocated. There was a side to the Doctor's character, a vein of tender sympathy, of sweet humanity, of large-hearted benevolence, of poetic sensibility that bathed all things in its luminous warmth, and withal a constitutional habit of looking first through his heart at whatever appealed to his head, whether a question of theology or of ritual, of action within Church lines or of measures of Catholic comprehension, a Mission, a Parish School, a Hospital or a S. Johnland Community, that exercised an irresistible magnetism over the Bishop. He used to say, after leaving the Doctor's

company, that to have a few hours with him in his happier moods was like drinking from a fountain of inspiration. Never, for a moment, swayed in his own work by what some thought the Doctor's benevolent or theoretical eccentricities, still the Bishop loved to hear them discoursed about by "the old man eloquent" when his visions of the coming day of the Church rose into saintly raptures. Certainly, however, there were many points on which there was deep sympathy between the two, many points, too, where the Doctor's character rather than his views told with great and lasting power. Unconsciously, spontaneously, because it was the outcome of his temperament, the Bishop, like his venerable friend, was disinclined to tarry longer than he could help on any of the formulated, dogmatic teaching of the Church. He was instant to get at the heart of it, to work out the sentiment of it, to make what was true in it live in every-day life; but as something to be analyzed, compared, traced along the lines of tradition, argued over, contended for as an assaulted outpost, he was repelled rather than attracted by it. He used to remark that he had but a poor talent for discussing the less tangible, somewhat metaphysical issues of systematic divinity; but he hoped that God had given him some grace to translate into a practical faith what was really true and good in them. The same cast of thought and feeling, little by little, determined not merely his style but his favorite themes as a Preacher, and gave to his sermons a certain quality which few of his hearers could define, but the singularly winning and touching power of which all acknowledged.

But however much of the man and of his career we may trace to these outside causes, far more of both must be sought in his own interior life and in his personal character, the latter in his, as in most cases, a half hidden force, in youth vaguely recognised and in early manhood only partially developed. And yet the portrait of the Bishop's character at 24 years of age, when he was ordained Priest, was substantially true of him to the last. From beginning to end, there were the same transparent frankness, the same purity of motive, the same tender,

sympathetic heart, the same magnanimous, chivalric unselfishness, the same lofty, unshrinking devotion to duty, the same cheerful, patient courage in the presence of difficulty or danger, the same wonderful faculty to make friends and to keep them when made, the same instinctive readiness to serve others, and, in doing so, to treat with graceful, unaffected indifference whatever concerned his own ease and comfort, and with all the same playful, spontaneous, contagious humor that made him more than welcome in the homes of his friends and a recognized favorite in more general and mixed social circles. One has only to run over in memory these traits, and every friend that now mourns him will instantly recall them, to account for the extraordinary affection with which those nearest to him regarded him and the attraction toward him—almost fascination experienced by those further removed. The writer knows not, never heard that he had an enemy. Somehow bitter tongues—tongues always ready to pick flaws, asperse motives, belittle good actions, and generally, to make things sour and unpleasant found no chance to ply their trade with him. It would, indeed have been a hard lot if one who was so gentle and courteous toward all and was at such pains, under all circumstances, to give no offence in anything had not escaped the rough handling of sharp and careless tongues of which, alas! the world is so full. It was this side of his character combined with habitual watchfulness in protecting his clergy from trial and want, and with an equally habitual readiness to share with them their troubles and privations that drew them to him by the ever strengthening bond of personal love. That his clergy who had been long with him should have shown, as they did, when gathered around his grave, such a sense of abandonment and desolation and grief was only what might have been expected.

And just here we may lift the veil a little—pierce somewhat the outer guise of the man to look in upon one of the hidden phases of his life. No one ever heard him say much, if anything, of that highest aim of the man of God—the internal ordering and discipline of the soul.

Wisely he left this to be judged by its fruits in every day life. But clearly none could be much with him and not feel that he kept himself close to the "Life of our Life,"—*Vita Vitæ Nostræ*. Beneath the sweet smile and the cheery, cordial manner, beneath the incessant tide of busy, bustling care, beneath the frequent anecdote and humorous play of speech, beneath the easy, buoyant bearing when on the long journey over the prairies or in the crowded thoroughfares of travel, the great battle of God's grace and of the sensitive conscience for what is best and against what is worst in the soul went on with all its sad, painful alternations. The rude, mixed, refractory metal of the natural man was melting in the furnace and the refiner's fire was busy separating the dross from the pure gold. The evidence of it was not in what he said, but in what he was, and of few has it been truer :

"Se sub serenis vultibus
Austera virtus occulit,
Timens videri, ne suum,
Dum prodit, amittat decus."

Turning now to his active life, we find him in 1851, Priest and Rector of S. James' Parish, Chicago, in which relation he continued some sixteen years building up, meanwhile, a remarkable record. Scarcely had he entered upon his duties when the cholera, in a most virulent form, scourged the city literally piling up the dead along its thoroughfares and byways. The most of the clergy terror-stricken fled from the town. Not so the young rector of S. James'. Heroically remaining at his post of duty, he nursed the sick, ministered to the poor, comforted the afflicted, visited the dying, buried the dead, until himself stricken down and brought to death's door. Recovering as by a miracle, he gave himself again to the task of rallying the courage of the people, and aiding to rebuild the broken hopes and fortunes of many a bereaved and desolate household. The city in the following years grew apace, but it did not outgrow the memory of his devotion and self-sacrifice. So long as he lived there, to multitudes who knew nothing of him as preacher or pastor, he was the object of a loving,

almost adoring homage. His parish soon grew from feebleness into strength and became known, far and near, for its generous liberality and varied beneficence. The Church built under his direction and largely by his energy was, at the time, the largest and, architecturally, the most celebrated in the North West. During this period his influence was widely felt in laying the foundations of the infant Diocese of Illinois and in giving practical shape to the initial movements that resulted in the establishment of Racine College, securing for it later on the headship of the Rev. James De Koven, whose culture, educational skill and personal force, though well known to him, were, at the time, taken on trust by the general Church public.

At the General Convention of 1865 he was elected Missionary Bishop of Nebraska and Dakota. The writer vividly recalls the Bishop's profound surprise and his days of painful conflict as to the course of duty. Deeming himself settled over S. James' for life, surrounded by all that could make a pastorate useful and happy, the object of the tenderest, most devoted friendships, in the midst of many half-developed plans, with a young family just beginning to need the privileges of good schools, with an ample salary and with many necessary demands upon it by others; on the other hand, Nebraska, some five hundred miles further West, and Dakota as many to the North, the former settled only along its Eastern edges, with scarcely forty miles of railroad built within its limits, the latter an untrodden wilderness, with here and there an Indian reservation, and both with only some six clergymen;—such were the two outlooks between which he must choose. He hesitated not to go out into the cold and dark of such a doubtful venture because of anything that might befall himself, but simply from a shrinking, almost unconquerable distrust of his ability to cope with the requirements. It was inexplicable to him that he should have been chosen for such a vast work, when there were so many of his brethren whom he thought far better qualified for it than himself. The result is before us and beyond all question it is one that will, for all time, link his name to one of the noblest and most fruit-

ful Missionary Episcopates of modern days. He went out to his field at an interesting moment in the history of our Missions. Just a little before the venerable and saintly Kemper had been compelled by the infirmities of age to lay down his commission, and to cease from his Apostolic journeyings and abundant labors in the vast jurisdiction given into his charge—now containing eight Dioceses. Just then, too, the administration of our Home Missions was beginning to feel the contagious zeal and energy of that scarcely less devoted and remarkable man—Dr. Twing, whose life and labors have entered into the most treasured traditions of the Church. Then, too, (in 1865) at the close of the great National struggle for unity, the tide of immigration into the regions West of the Mississippi was largely accelerated, and heralded the mighty volume of population soon to roll over the vast prairies of Iowa, Nebraska, and Kansas. Only a little before Bishop Vail had gone to Kansas, and soon after Bishop Tuttle was sent to Utah, Idaho and Montana, and Bishop Morris to Oregon and Washington. The heart of the Church began to throb as never before with Missionary aspirations and the gifts of God's people were correspondingly multiplied. How vividly the writer recalls the two summer months in 1867 spent with Bishop Clarkson in Nebraska purposely to accompany him on his journeys and to assist him in his work, sometimes reading service and sometimes preaching for him wherever, according to the Bishop's wont, a few could be gathered together at the cross roads, or in private houses, or school buildings or barns, or village halls and court rooms. How gratefully was he welcomed, how fondly was he listened to, how the lonely settlers long estranged from Worship and Sacrament crowded around him for counsel and sympathy, how often at the close did he preside over little gatherings to devise ways and means for the erection of modest chapels and for the visits of itinerating missionaries. The memory reaches back through blinding tears to those early chapters of the Bishop's work so full of sleepless activity, ungrudging self-sacrifice, patient courage, and in short, of every quality that adorns a true apostle of

JESUS CHRIST. It must be remembered, too, that Bishop Clarkson helped to organize not only a Diocese, but a State. Nebraska reveres and loves him quite as much for what he did as a citizen, as for what he did as a Prelate. From the day he entered the territory he engaged actively in shaping its social and political interests, and in the great task of laying the foundations of the future State he made himself felt far beyond the customary limits of clerical influence. At the start he predicted the coming wealth and power of the land of his adoption, always speaking of it to the timid and the doubting in language of such ardor and energy as only fitly expressed his own enthusiastic hopes. In those early days, and amid the rude, coarsely-jointed elements of life about him, his own character, formed under the finer influences of more advanced and better-ordered communities, was in itself an enormous contribution of moral and intellectual strength. He found abundant natural resources without the capital or the intelligence to develop them. He found a number of weak, widely-separated settlements with no bond of cohesion to keep alive the sense of common interests or to encourage concert of action; struggling simply to live with little or no thought of the sobering influences of religion, or the refining ones of education. He had to deal with men mostly under forty years of age, whom accident or impulse had brought there full of the spirit of adventure and of a consuming greed for lands and money. At once he set himself to building Churches, founding schools, and elevating the tone of domestic life, everywhere by example and speech holding up before the people the ideal of a society that could be strong and happy only as it should acknowledge the supremacy of the law of God and suitably provide for a wise and healthy training of the young. Later on, after the Territory had been erected into a State, and population came rolling into its borders in gigantic waves of life, and industries of every name took root, and villages expanded into cities, and lands rapidly advanced in value, and railways, mills, banks, herds, farms and the thousand forms of material wealth started up on all sides as by magic, and as a consequence

the people began to be crazed with their prosperity, he, again, with set purpose, went forth over the land proclaiming, as part of his missionary preaching, the only true elements of a beneficent civilization. Like another John the Baptist he warned and rebuked the masses for their hot, coarse, blind passion for riches and their forgetfulness of the things that make for the advancement of the higher nature of man. With a strange fervor and eloquence he pleaded before whole communities, who gazed upon him as a kind of apocryphal apparition, for the intellectual, the moral, the Christian, as against the riches-making, pleasure-seeking, grossly materialistic conditions of social life. Doubtless in many cases the dark, turbid wave against which he fought rolled over him, but he was none the less a prophet of God's sending, none the less a master-builder of the foundations of that commonwealth on the rock of truth and righteousness. Some years after, when a riper, better-balanced life began to see how he had wrought for it in the days of its blindness and anarchy, and to recognize, as already half realized, the lofty ideal he had, through good and evil report, held up before it, men who cared little for him, as a Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, acknowledged with gratitude his inestimable services to society and the state. And still further on, when he came to build his Cathedral and needed far more help than it seemed possible for him to command, the same men counted it their pride and joy to pour their treasure into his hands and to join with him in songs of thanksgiving on the day of its consecration. So, in a way least expected by him, a harvest came to him in his last years from that sowing beside all Nebraska's waters of the seed of Christian patriotism as supplementary to the seed of CHRIST'S Gospel.

The invisible results of the life-work of Bishop Clarkson may not be told in words or statistics. They are known only to God. But we know this much, that they are profound, far-spread and lasting. Thousands of hearts scattered through the Church warmed into missionary zeal by his fervid, often pathetic appeals will continue

until death to pray and to give for the cause to which his all was consecrated. His Clergy and his Laity will long be guided and animated by his example and the memory of his labors; while his successors in the Episcopate for some generations to come will count it an honor to reap where he planted and to build higher on the foundations he laid. As for the visible fruits left behind him they are as varied as they are remarkable—including the Cathedral, fifty Churches and Chapels, two well-equipped Diocesan schools, a Hospital, a Bishop's residence, built alongside the Cathedral—its rental devoted to the benefit of the Diocese—himself living in his own house, an Episcopal Fund of nearly forty thousand dollars, and a well organized Diocese with all its lines of activity definitely traced and vigorously maintained.*

In dwelling upon the Bishop's character and work, and especially upon the splendid fruits of his labors, it is impossible to pass by in silence the devoted woman, the faithful wife who survives him. None could know much of him, or be much with him without hearing from his lips the most touching and beautiful testimony, not only to what she was in domestic life, but also to what she was to him amid the toils and anxieties of his high Office. We say here only what he was in the habit of saying, when we say that few men have had so much in this way to be thankful for. To her bright, hopeful, happy temperament, to her prudence in affairs, and her intuitive, unerring, practical judgment, to her graceful, winning manners, to her invincible courage amid trial and difficulty, and her cheery, habitual readiness to face hardship and privation—to all these, united with sweeter, tenderer graces that may not be named, the Bishop always declared himself indebted largely for his success in every marked crisis of his life. She is left to mourn with a great sorrow, to watch over his grave, to go in and out of the places that he loved, to cherish the memory of what

* During his Missionary Episcopate Bishop Clarkson collected and expended in his jurisdiction \$160,421.57. This was outside all the stated appropriations by the Board of Missions. At the time of his death, he was in advance \$1,797.00. Had he lived, this sum would no doubt have been obtained by him from his numerous friends. It remains to be seen what action will or can be taken in regard to it.

he was and did. GOD grant that she may be comforted not only as it is promised that all His true Children shall be, when stricken, but with the added comfort of dwelling, through many a year, on that beneficent life, that spotless character, that fruitful and noble Episcopate which will long be a praise and joy in our American Church.

It is with a throb of pain and a sense of loneliness that the writer traces these last lines to the name and memory of ROBERT HARPER CLARKSON. They seem like the final farewell, this side of eternity, to one whom, for thirty years, he loved tenderly as a friend, respected profoundly as a man, and, during all the period of his Episcopate, took sweet counsel with as a Bishop in the Church of GOD.

A. N. LITTLEJOHN.

THE GENERAL CONVENTION OF 1883.

IT can hardly be denied that the recent General Convention marks an epoch in the history of the American Church. I say marks, not makes, for representative bodies, as a rule, do but indicate, and do not create, movements in the mind or thought of a period. There was a striking difference between this Convention and most of its predecessors, not only in its acts but in its tone and temper, but that difference did but indicate the temper of the Church. After the Convention of 1880, the Rev. Dr. Washburn, in a discourse to his people in Calvary Church, N. Y., expressed thankfulness that the Convention had come and gone, and done little or nothing. Many Churchmen, indeed, used to look on the General Conventions of the Church with something of the same feeling with which the session of a State Legislature, or of Congress is regarded by business men, a fear lest in some way they should do mischief. There was a feeling of relief when such a Legislative body had finished its session and left no mark on the polity or principles, or even the forms, of the Church. But of the last Convention it must be said, that although like all human beings or bodies, they may perhaps have left undone some things which they ought to have done, they did much which in itself and in the temper and manner of doing it, affords reason for encouragement, gratitude and hope.

There was a striking absence of any manifestations of party spirit in the sayings and doings of this body. It would often not have been easy for a stranger to have determined, by the speeches or the manner of the speak-

ers, to what school, or party if you please, this or that one belonged. With one or two exceptions, there was nothing in the motions or propositions brought forward pointing in the direction of any marked line of ecclesiastical or theological teaching. A learned Deputy from Illinois expressed his distress of conscience at reciting the symbol called in the Prayer Book, "the Nicene Creed," because it asserts the doctrine of the double procession of the Spirit, and this might bar a union with the Greek Church. I am not aware that the Greek Church has ever manifested any readiness or willingness for any intercommunion with ours or any other Church, unless the petitioner will accept the yoke of the inflexible system, which she calls Orthodoxy, but we might not.* The learned Deputy also overlooked the fact, that in the third invocation of the Litany, which he probably utters solemnly Sunday by Sunday, the obnoxious doctrine is asserted quite as explicitly as in the Creed. But his proposal to alter the Prayer Book on this account excited but a very languid attention, and was rather summarily disposed of. The addition of the words "so called" to the title of the symbol might indeed be defended as historically correct, as well as quite harmless. Then there was a clerical Deputy from a Western Diocese (and he had a few followers), who brought up the old objection to the name Protestant Episcopal, but upon the new and ingenious theory, that Protestant was a Popish appellation. His objection to the word Episcopal he did not get time to develop; but his complaint of the word Protestant seemed to be, that by using that word we admitted that we belonged to or were a part of the Church of Rome, against which we were protesting. It did not seem to have occurred to the learned gentleman, that a protest might be made by one branch of the Church Catholic, or by its Bishops or Clergy or people,

* Cardinal Newman in his preface to Mr. Palmers' curious story of his effort to obtain communion or intercommunion with the Eastern Church, thus states, and quite accurately, the answer of the Russian Ecclesiasties: "We know of no true Church beside our own. The Latins are heretics, or all but heretics, you are worse, we do not even know your name." Again, "If England would approach the Russian Church with a view to ecclesiastical union, she must do so through her legitimate Patriarch, the Bishop of Rome."

or all three, against an assertion of dominion over them by another branch of the Church, or its Bishops.

We need not and do not adopt the opinions, or stand in the shoes of the men who first called themselves Protestants. But we must have a name to distinguish us from other ecclesiastical bodies in courts and in common speech, and before the country, and whatever else we may be or claim to be, we are distinctively Protestant and Episcopal, in a proper sense, and the old name, awkward though it seems, describes our position fairly.

I think many were sorry to see the earnest opposition which was made by a distinguished Deputy from New York, to the motion of Dr. Brooks to leave out of the Gospel for the day when the chapter occurs the disputed text of the three witnesses. It surely could not commit the Church to a denial of the authenticity of this verse, simply to omit reading it in this solemn way. The authenticity of this text is denied by at least a moiety in number and learning of those who have examined and discussed the question, and may at least be called doubtful. Perhaps I might go further than this, but this it seems to me is far enough to justify the motion. The Church ought not to be made affirmatively or authoritatively to teach the people that a certain verse, and that a very positive verse, is a part of Scripture, and when a very large proportion of scholars and learned men, with the aid of all modern discoveries and appliances, deny that it is genuine. Because we find it in the book we are not bound to keep it there, when we find that insisting on its retention commits the Church to one side of a doubtful controversy in Biblical criticism. Its omission on the other hand would assert nothing, and might relieve some who dislike being made apparently to teach affirmatively the inspiration of what they do not believe to be genuine. The proposition merely means that the Liturgy should be relieved from taking either side of a question which has come to be seriously disputed.

But these were only ripples on a smooth current. The Clergy and Laity who represented the Dioceses, had evidently come bent upon one great purpose, and deter-

mined to accomplish that and waste no time otherwise. To give richness and flexibility to the Prayer Book, to provide shorter and in some cases additional services, was the work which the members felt they had to do. The wise constitution of the Committee which was put in charge of this work in 1880, the excellent manner in which they had performed their work, their clear and thorough report, put into the hands of the Deputies before they assembled, and the wonderfully skilful manner in which the matter was managed in the House of Deputies by the Rev. Dr. Huntington, led to the happiest results. The members of the House were both absorbed in this the great work of the session, and penetrated by the generous and Catholic spirit, with which a committee composed of able men, of many different tempers and schools of thought, had harmoniously agreed. There was no better way to teach the lesson that comprehension and not toleration is the principle of our Church. Our services must, if they are to be useful and acceptable, continue as they now are, fitted for use by people of differing temperaments and schools of thought. The Bishop of Western New York, in some utterances since the Convention, criticising its work on the Prayer Book, which does not seem to meet with his approbation, remarks that such a work as this can only be properly done by a select committee and is not a suitable undertaking for a numerous body. This is true to a certain extent. But what the Convention propose to give us is the work of a committee. The House of Deputies showed a remarkable determination to accept whatever the Committee recommended, just as they recommended it. There are singularly few alterations in what the Committee proposed, and hardly in any case did the House depart from what Dr. Huntington, the spokesman of the Committee, advocated. The Bishop would hardly expect the Clergy and Laity of the Church to put the revision of our Prayer Book out of their hands, or to delegate to any committee of Bishops, Priests or Laymen, the unrestricted power to remodel or alter our services. Such a question as the amendment of the

Liturgy must come before the whole Church, or its Supreme Council. Now we have the recommendation of a thoroughly representative, as well as able Committee, approved by one Council of the Church, and after three years more of reflection and study, another Council will, I am persuaded, be able to act finally on these recommendations. I am not in favor of any longer delay.

Things move rapidly in this age and country, and if we are to do our duty where Providence has placed us, we should not spend any unnecessary time in preparing the instruments with which we can best work. Bishop Thorold in his speech to the Board of Missions said, speaking of our Church as well as his own, "our services and our Liturgy and the methods of our preaching are absolutely unintelligible to the masses whom we desire to reach with the Gospel of CHRIST. If they were to try to follow our Liturgy, they would be unable to do so." I hardly think that our Clergy will accept the English Bishop as a competent or at least an entirely accurate witness as to this country. Still there is truth in this picture of the present state of things, and if it be half true, it is high time that we awake and set about preparing in earnest for real work.

The action of the Convention in the revision of the Prayer Book I hope to consider more at large at another time. Meanwhile a word may be said upon a question which has been very ably discussed by my colleague, Mr. S. P. Nash, in the November number of this REVIEW. In his words, "must the Convention of 1886 take (or reject) the work literally and exactly as it is now left, or will it have the power, within the general scope of the several alterations as now proposed, to make such modifications in them as more careful criticism and matured opinion shall show desirable, and then to adopt finally and without farther delay, the proposed changes so perfected?" Mr. Nash's opinion is that the Convention of 1886 may modify or amend the alterations proposed by the Convention of 1883. And that its action upon any alteration so amended will be final, and not a new proposition. I agree with this general view. Little can be added to

the arguments and illustrations by which it is supported by Mr. Nash. The language of the Constitution is "no alteration or addition shall be made in the Book of Common Prayer—unless the same shall be proposed in one General Convention, and by a resolve thereof made known to every Diocese, and adopted at the subsequent General Convention." This language should be fairly, but not too narrowly construed. The action is to be by the General Convention alone, which gives notice to the Dioceses that it proposes to adopt certain changes or additions, and after finding and considering the sense of the Dioceses upon the subject—indicated it may be by resolutions, or simply 'by the choice of delegates, the General Council of the Church is to take final action. It does not submit a proposition to a distinct body, as a Diocesan Convention, or to any form of popular approval, as is done in the familiar instance of amendments to State Constitutions, which are framed by Legislatures, and submitted to a popular vote. There the people cannot adopt, nor can a second Legislature act upon anything but the amendment proposed in *ipsissimis verbis*. There can be no amendment of such a proposition. But here the first action of the General Convention is in effect a notice of what they propose to do. The subsequent Convention is to act, to adopt or to reject. They must preserve the substantial identity of the proposed alteration or amendment, but I cannot see why they may not adopt what is proposed with such verbal alterations not affecting the substance or substituting one thing for another as they may think called for. There can be no substitute of something different for what is proposed, but as in the progress of a measure through a deliberative body, the measure may be amended, provided it still continues the same thing. To take one of the illustrations given by Mr. Nash. It is proposed to introduce the Beatitudes into the Liturgy, to be repeated with a suitable response after each. Now the response proposed by the Convention of 1883, may be amended, or changed, it seems to me very freely, by the Convention of 1886 if they adopt the proposed addition of the Beatitude

service. But I suppose they could not under cover of this proposition, for instance, restore the Commination or Cursing service which the English Church prescribes for Ash Wednesday, not that I suppose any one would desire to do so. And so I think the Convention of 1886 could hardly do, what probably a good many would like to see done, adopt this Beatitude service not only, but authorize its use in the Communion service, either constantly or occasionally, as a substitute for the Decalogue. I have not time or space at present to dwell on this subject, I leave it with this brief expression of what occurs to me; in truth however, the article of Mr. Nash leaves little to be said.

The Convention accomplished easily one work which alone would have been enough for one triennial meeting. I mean the reconstruction of the General Theological Seminary. The number of Trustees was reduced from its former cumbrous extent. They are to be appointed as far as possible by the General Convention, which represents the whole Church collectively, and it is to be hoped that the character of their appointment, as well as the comparative fewness of their number, will make gentlemen who are chosen to these positions feel their responsibility and constrain them all to do their duty. If the temper of the debate on this subject on all sides, is any indication of the temper of the Church, we may not unreasonably expect that, under the guidance of the present Dean especially, there shall be no longer occasion to accuse the Seminary of being a propaganda exclusively of one set of theological and ecclesiastical opinions. It comes more distinctly under the control of the whole Church, as represented in its highest Council, and it ought not to fail to represent the whole.

There is one matter as to which I think we must feel sorry that the Convention did little or nothing. The condition of the freedmen of the colored race, in the Southern States, is clearly one of the most urgent subjects for Church action. Whatever duties Christians may owe to heathens abroad, or to Indians at home, they cannot be excused for neglecting the black men.

In a few places and by a few men in the Southern States, good and earnest work is doing among the freedmen, but as a whole our Church is not coming up to her claims, nor doing justice to herself. After the Sewanee Conference, and the animated discussion at the Church Congress in Richmond, in 1882, something practical might have been expected from the General Convention. When the English Bishop of Rochester told his hearers at the Board of Missions that "our services and our Liturgy and the methods of our preaching were absolutely unintelligible to the masses whom we desire to reach," he said what may be very nearly true as far as the freedmen are concerned. But is that any reason why these people should be neglected, why the Church should pass them by on the other side? Was the Prayer Book made for the Church, or the Church for the Prayer Book? If these people cannot join in our services as they are, in all their full and formal rigidity, let the service be unbent and made more suitable for those excitable and emotional people. They can be made flexible without giving up the features which will always make a Liturgy of the ages better for any such use than an extemporized form. Should the blacks be encouraged to have Clergy of their own color? Is it best to give them a separate organization within the Church? It is a pity that the Convention did not take up and consider these questions and the whole subject of ministrations among the freedmen. They are questions upon which the advice of the Southern Clergy and Laity who have these people among them, and have had so many opportunities to study them, should be carefully heeded. But they are questions which the whole Church will have to answer speedily, or it will neglect its duty as well as its opportunity in a very marked way. Let us hope, both for the sake of the Church and the Country, that the subject will be thoroughly considered and dealt with by the next General Convention.

JAMES EMOTT.

THE EDUCATION OF BOYS.

I PURPORT in the following article to describe the standard attained by certain boys of fourteen years of age in England, and the process by which they are prepared to reach it.

Knowing how curiously ignorant people may be even of their next door neighbors, I make no apology for assuming that to many of my readers the modes of Education in vogue on the other side of the Atlantic are not clearly known. The Board Schools and Voluntary Schools open their doors to the children of the masses, through which the Education Code of 1870, requiring the attendance of such children as are not being otherwise instructed compels them to pass. This compulsory force is applied by an officer termed "The Visitor," whose duty it is to visit the houses of the people and see that the children are in regular school attendance.

Before the Educational Bill, piloted by Mr. Foster, was passed, the schools for the working classes were all voluntary; that is, the subscriptions by which they were supported were given voluntarily. The Church of England owned them almost entirely. Upon these schools, which were known before 1870, as National Schools, the Church had expended in construction and maintenance no less a sum than \$137,000,000. In the questionable light of this latter part of the XIX century, there are not a few who assert that the State ought to educate its children, and seeing that the State comprises "Jews, Turks, Infidels and Heretics" as well as Christians, the only possible platform on which the children, or rather their parents, are likely to agree is the strictly non-

religious. That the State schools should be secular, is the dictum of those who advocate State Education.

Various compromises have been adopted on each side of the Atlantic to make this hard and fast proposition acceptable to the vast majority of taxpayers, and the result is that some sort of religious instruction by one or another process has been preserved in all the State schools, which are known as Board Schools in England. But now that this "godless" system, which is practically borrowed from this side the Atlantic, has had a thirteen years' trial, a reaction is setting in.

The Education Act of 1870, required each School District to provide so many "places" for its children. If the existing schools could not reach the requirement then a "Board" was publicly elected by the rate-payers, who were to erect schools, thus known as Board Schools, and provide for the deficiency. The Church, which offered more school accommodation than all the other agencies combined, was determined not to be forced from her prominent position, and she has succeeded. Since 1870, her people have contributed \$25,000,000 to enlarge their schools, and at the present moment she spends \$3,000,000 annually on the education of the laboring classes.

Although it may be true that in some districts the Church has been unable to secure sufficient money to cope with the rate-aided Board School; still in these localities, the Vicar of the parish and one or two of his curates invariably secure seats on the Board and so to a large extent maintain their influence; especially so, as they have more time and more love to devote to the work than the energetic supporter of secular education. So that although one-third of the children are being educated in Board Schools, still it is not to be concluded that this means that one-third of the children are out of contact with the Clergy of the Church.

But the wind which came from another quarter has risen to a gale, and when the Conservative Government comes in, as it is sure to do in the near future, the educational craft will be driven much nearer to her old course. As might be expected, the management of the Board

Schools is very much more expensive than that of the Voluntary Schools. The tax which Mr. Gladstone estimated in 1870, would never exceed 6 cents in \$5. of the ratable value of property, has in some districts reached even nearly 50 cents! It takes a long time for an idea to penetrate through the thick cranium of an Anglo-Saxon of the ordinary sort, but when it once is comprehended it is held with strange tenacity

The British rate-payer is beginning to apprehend that his child can be quite as well and even better taught, for the same Inspector examines and reports on all schools alike, in the voluntary as in the Board Schools; that he pays his school rate for the school to which he does not send his child, that the running expenses of the Voluntary School are much less than the Board School, and yet it is quite as efficient; that it is eminently unfair that a rate-payer should be taxed and yet pay a subscription to the Voluntary School. Remedies are being agitated which no doubt will be granted, either each Voluntary child shall have an allowance from the rate, or the Voluntary subscription to the school shall be a *pro tanto* "set off" against the subscriber's rate. And when thus evident justice is achieved, the process of education by the Church will be rendered easy. To many this may not seem a great desideratum, but the chief good is not upon the surface. The 25,000 Clergy of the Church of England are well nigh all refined and educated gentlemen. Their wives and daughters are gentle-folk. There is not a square yard in England that is not in some Vicar's parish, and no village has not its Church and its parson, who with the squire is "the person" of the community. The Parson and his family are on an equality with the gentry. No dinner is given at the Hall at which the Vicar is not present. Her ladyship gathers no garden party at which the Vicar's wife and daughters are not to be seen. As the head of the Church is the Primate of all England, and takes rank next to the royal blood, so the Clergy have their recognized position. And although they may have but small incomes, yet the villagers innately disconnect wealth with the Clergy, and look upon

the Vicar and his family in the same light as upon representatives of the old Feudal Baron, who still lives in his grandeur "up at The House." Thus by virtue of the institution of the State Church, it is brought to pass that a gentleman and his family live amongst the villagers. The Parish School sees them every day. The Vicar regularly examines the classes, his wife and daughters bring plain needle-work to be done and "look at the sewing" nearly every day. They all know the name of every child, and usually have some home question to ask here and there. The mere contact with such estimable gentlefolk has an effect upon the working classes of England which can be in some sort appreciated by visiting alternately a city school and a village school. The difference in the reserve, the respect, the manners, of the two schools is curiously evident, and it is palpable that the Church school has an advantage which is not to be paid for either by school pence or "The Rates."

Apart from the Religious question this is a benefit well known to the thinking people of England, and so highly appreciated that it will be only a mighty struggle which will deprive country schools of the boon of the personal and unpaid attention of the Vicar and his family.

There are two other sources of strength which greatly tend to the successful education of children of the masses.

(1). The Government's inspection of the schools. Every year, H. M. I. Her Majesty's Inspector, makes his examination of the schools. He is a man of high attainments, often a Fellow of his College, and he enjoys a good salary. His advent is of more importance than the Archdeacon's visitation or the presence of the Bishop, for much depends upon the result of his inspection, and his report is anxiously awaited. The Master, if he be but lately from the Training College, may not "get his parchment"—a diploma which pronounces him a fully qualified teacher—and eligible for certain positions and emoluments. He will not be paid for his tuition of his pupil teachers, unless they satisfy the examiner, and above all, the Government Grant will be only "earned"

by those children who pass the required standard. To these stimulants may also be added the rivalry that exists between Parishes and the very proper pride a clergyman feels in the excellence of his schools—a pride which is not wholly immaterial. For patrons of livings more frequently judge of the worth of a clergyman by the condition of his schools than by anything else. I remember one of my father's curates who had been a Dissenting Minister, and via a Theological College had entered the Church. He lacked that polish which University men usually possess. He was not a brilliant preacher, yet he worked his schools well. He went to a small living in a great Northern town. The population of his parish was 10,000 and his income \$1,500 and a house; his schools were of course large and he brought them to a state of great excellence, for which the Bishop rewarded him with one of his best livings. He now enjoys above \$5,000 a year, a beautiful house and a restored Church, and when the crime of age falls upon him, there is no Vestry to elect a successor over his head; but if he becomes worn out after a long and useful life, his ample income will well supply his parish with curates, and he will rest in peace until they bury him under the chancel of his Church, and record his virtues on a marble tablet on the North wall. I record this instance and it is not by any means the only one, I know, because its circumstances refute many notions as to the distribution of patronage which I have heard currently expressed.

(2). The other element in the success of the educational agency of the Church is found in her Diocesan Training Colleges. The National Schoolmasters and Mistresses are trained for their difficult work. As I was connected with one of the best of those Institutions for a short time, I can speak with certainty as to the thoroughness of the training. It must have been some good and sufficient reason which caused our forefathers to fix the limit of apprenticeship at seven years. Is there any subtle influence which requires for its full attainment seven years which lies at the root of all perfect work? And is it for this that seven is the ancient emblem for "Perfection?"

Certain well defined causes sufficed to break up the apprenticeship system in its old form, but it is found in its reality still to exist, and wherever there is anything approaching to perfection of work, there the result of at least seven years of experience is being brought to bear.

The National Schoolmaster had apprenticed to him two or three boys learning the profession and called "Pupil teachers." They were paid for their services, and he was paid for teaching them by a nicely adjusted scale at the end of five years. It may have been earlier under certain circumstances. They proceeded to the Training College, where after three years they passed their final examination and obtained their "certificate." To these training colleges there is attached a *model school*, in which the plentiful experience of the quondam pupil teacher is refined down to the most approved edge, and when he goes to his own school he is *au fait* with the very best processes of that education to the imparting of which he has dedicated his life.

I have spent thus much time in describing the system of Elementary Education, because after all, the same processes are used only at a higher level for that more advanced education which is rather the subject of this article. Lord Brougham once said that he hoped to see the day when every man in England would read Bacon, to which William Cobbett rejoined, he should be satisfied if he lived to see every man eating bacon! Each spoke from his own stand point, that of the professional man and of the artizan. Few will admit that it is the business of the State to undertake the education of any other than the industrial class; to furnish such rudimentary knowledge as may be necessary to give the clever rising artificer the power to acquaint himself with the text books of his craft. The prime difficulty is where to draw the line; what knowledge is essential and what is non-essential; at what point has the pupil received all he needs, and when should he be dispatched to learn his trade and earn his bacon.

It is no part of my purpose to discuss this question, but to enter a region in which the State makes no at-

tempt to possess a status. Though it may give the boys in the Board Schools the opportunity of acquiring the reading of Bacon it has never professed to lead them up to the feet of that philosopher. And the more so because the system which does accomplish this higher reach is sustained by private enterprise and endowment.

The schools in England which glory in the title "Public," a title which has lost its initial meaning, are Eton, Harrow, Winchester, Westminster, Rugby, and Marlborough. And then come a score of other schools of equal importance, but to which long custom has not applied the term "public." Some of these schools have more than 1,000 boys. Eton is probably the most expensive. A boy cannot well be educated at Eton under \$1,000 a year, and he may readily spend twice that amount, whereas at the least expensive, \$500 must be provided. But as these schools are usually full and in the favorite masters' houses there is no vacancy for four or five years in advance, it becomes necessary that applicants should be admitted by an Entrance Examination, not only to enable the authorities to select those boys who are most likely to uphold the credit of the school, but also to ensure that the new comers shall be sufficiently advanced to join a form suitable to their age. This necessitates a class of schools termed Preparatory schools, where boys destined for a public school are sent. These preparatory schools are more important to the formation of character and to mental development than any after process to which the boy may be subjected. As this became the settled path upon which a boy belonging to the upper 10,000 began to walk his life, the demand led to the consequent supply, and men of great attainment, Fellows of their college, even, were found at the head of fifty or sixty boys ranging in age from seven to fourteen years. The natural result has followed, that these preparatory schools have been brought to a very high degree of perfection, and it is really astonishing to find what a boy, carefully taught, surrounded by the best appliances, housed and fed in the most approved manner, may be capable of attaining.

As is well known the public schools as well as the universities have property out of the income of which Scholarships and Fellowships are endowed. In the University of Dublin a Senior Fellowship is worth \$20,000 a year. The Fellowships in Oxford and Cambridge are more numerous, more easily obtained and not so lucrative. Still a very Junior Fellow of a College will have his rooms, commons, and \$1,500 a year. This income he readily augments by Lectureships and other college offices, but the \$1,500 is paid to him wherever he may be, provided he does not marry. One of the Fellows of a Cambridge College I lately saw driving his team up the trail to North Park in our Rocky Mountains, whither he was on his way to pre-empt a claim. He still receives his \$1,500 a year from Cambridge.

The Public Schools are old foundations and their charters require that a certain number of the sons of the burgesses shall be taught in them for a nominal fee. Hence many gentlemen of limited income reside in towns where there is a Public or Foundation School for the benefit of the cheap education. Anthony Trollope, as he has lately told us, was at school at Harrow under these circumstances. The masters of public schools have houses which are filled with boarders from the private connexion of the head of the House. By far the greater part of the income of the master is drawn from this source. The fees actually paid for "tuition" are comparatively small. The income of the school as a corporation is mainly derived from estates which benefactors have bequeathed along the lapse of two or three centuries, and from this source "Foundation Scholarships" are endowed, and also school scholarships to the University. The recipient of one of these scholarships is almost entirely franked in his school and college course, for a Foundation scholar of a Public School is sure to obtain scholarships at the University. The standard of these Entrance scholarships has been gradually raised, as it was found boys were capable of reaching it. To indicate its precise position I transcribe a fair sample of the questions asked, in the papers set for the Entrance

Scholarships at Rugby in June, 1882. It is very probable that the successful candidates were not above thirteen. No boy over fourteen is admissible.

Those boys specially proficient in classics, mathematics, French or science, might obtain Scholarships devoted to these subjects, but all the candidates are required to do the same papers up to a certain point. Then special papers in their special subjects. Boys who fail to obtain 75 per cent. of the total marks are not successful.

ARITHMETIC PAPER.

6. A cube of stone of 9 inches edge is immersed in a cistern partly filled with water, whose length and breadth are 1 foot 9 inches and 1 foot 3 inches: how much will it raise the water?

7. If the planet Venus and the Earth revolve round the Sun in 224.7 and 365.25 days respectively, at what intervals will the three be in a line?

11. How much stock must be transferred from 3 per cents. at 100 $\frac{1}{8}$, to 4 per cents. at 99 $\frac{1}{2}$ to produce in the latter a half-yearly dividend of £50?

LATIN UNSEEN.

1. Vellem di immortales fecissent, patres conscripti, ut vivo potius Ser. Sulpicio gratias ageremus quam honores mortuo quæreremus. Nec vero dubito quin, si ille vir legationem renunciare potuisset, reditus eius et vobis gratus fuerit et rei publicæ salutaris futurus, non quo L. Philippo et L. Pisoni aut studium aut cura defuerit in tanto officio tantoque munere, etc., and twice as much more.

2. Felix, qui patriis ævum transegit in agris.

Ipsa domus puerum quem videt, ipsa senem;

Qui baculo nitens, in qua reptavit arena,

Unius numeret saecula longa casae.

Illum non vario traxit Fortuna tumultu;

Nec bibit ignotas mobilis hospes aquas.

And twelve other lines.

LATIN PROSE.

1. A monkey was sitting up in a high tree, when, seeing some fishermen laying their nets in a river, he watched what they were doing. The men had no sooner

set their nets, and retired a short distance to their dinner, than the monkey came down from the tree thinking he would try his hand at the same sport, etc. The latter half introduces direct narration.

2. He called a council of war. The majority pronounced against fighting, and Clive declared his concurrence with the majority. Long afterward he said he had never called but one council of war, and that, if he had taken the advice of that council, the British would never have been masters of Bengal, etc. And an equal quantity more.

GREEK UNSEEN.

1. *Τί δῆτ' ἐμοὶ ζῆν ἥδύ; πρὸς τί χορὴ βλέπειν;
πρὸς τὰς παρούσας ἢ παρελθούσας τυχὰς;
εἰς παῖς δὲ ἦν μοι λοιπὸς ὀφθαλμὸς βίου
τοῦτον κτενεῖν μέλλουσιν οἷς δοκεῖ τάδε.
οὐ δῆτα τοῦμὸν γ' οὖνεκ' ἀθλίου βίου.*

and ten more lines.

2. The Greek prose is twenty lines of a conversation between Socrates and Ischomachos.

GRAMMAR PAPER.

1. Write down the English, gender and accusative plural, of

Lebes, rete, lacunar, sibilus, for *ἱερεὺς, ἀγδών, κλείς, ἔ, ἄστυ*.

And the perfect indicative active of *auferre, confidere, obolino, sordesco, frigesco*. *λαγχάνω, μίγνυμι, κράζω, φθάνω*.

Three and four are sentences to be put into Greek and Latin.

4. Compare the earlier and later uses of the Article in Greek.

6. Give reasons for the subjunctive mood in the following sentences without translating:

(1) *Migrantes cernas*. (2) *quid faceret?* (3) *Sine eamus*. (4) *hospes, qui omnia cuperet rite facta, abiit*. (5) *aedem vovit, si hostes fudisset*. (6) *questus est quod sibi negavissem*.

Put into Greek the words in Italics:

(1) *Whosoever wishes*, may go. (2) Do not stop me *from coming*. (3) Do not go *till I come*. (4) They sent men *to say*. (5) They asked *who was absent*.

8. How do you render the indefinite pronoun "one" and the expression, "without doing so and so," in Latin?

Give the vocative of "fluvius," the meaning of the symbol H.S. X, and the Latin in full for the day of the month.

DIVINITY AND HISTORY.

1. Who were the chief enemies conquered by David? What was the extent of his kingdom when greatest? What his first capital?

2. Under what government were the Jews after the Captivity down to the destruction of Jerusalem?

3. Who were the Samaritans, the Sadducees, the Sanhedrin? What is known of the life and work of S. Peter after the Day of Pentecost, and of Philemon, Eutychus Philippi (in connection with S. Paul)?

4. What constitutional changes were introduced at Athens by Solon and by Cleisthenes? And at Rome by the Licinian Rogations and by the Sempronian laws?

5. Give short accounts of the Ionian Revolt, the revolution of the Four Hundred, the Sacred War?

6. How did the physical configuration of Italy affect the history of ancient Rome?

7. Between whom were the following battles fought, and with what results: Mycale, Ænophyta, Leuctra, Ipsus, Alia, Asculum, Metaurus, Vercellæ?

8. What do you know about the Heptarchy, the Hundred Years' War, the Declaration of Independence, the two Caliphates, Guelfs and Ghibellines, the Thirty Years' War, the Division of Poland?

9. Who were Attila, Charles Martel, Peter the Hermit, Tamerlane, William the Silent, Charles the Twelfth of Sweden, Cortes, the Young Pretender, Dupleix, Mirabeau, and Cavour?

10. Explain the following names and phrases: Pentecost, Jubilee, Proselyte, Canonical, the Vulgate, the Revised Version; Habeas Corpus, Act of Attainder, the Balance of Power, Protection, the Cabinet Home Rule, Disestablishment, Nihilist.

11. What wars have there been in Europe since 1850, and what changes have they made in the map of Europe?

In what wars out of Europe has England been engaged during the same period?

I have transcribed the whole of this paper because it best describes the area over which a boy under fourteen is known to be capable of reading. As no text books of any kind are recommended, the candidate is liable to such questions as these lying upon the wide surface of ancient and modern history.

ENGLISH COMPOSITION.

One subject to be selected out of these :

1. Hereditary qualities.
2. The good old Times.
3. The Spirit of Compromise exemplified in English History.
4. The Good and Evil of Romances.
5. For English verse, The Death bed of Garibaldi.
6. The battle on Mount Gilboa.

The foregoing papers are common to all candidates, these which follow are intended for those trying for Scholarships in their particular subjects, classics, mathematics, science or French.

GREEK IAMBICS.

O dearest of men save thou *me here*. Me bearing *commands* to tell the Queen *of these thy* fellow townsmen, suffering what kind of woes. They die by famine, and to get *relief*. But not with bars accustomed shall he drive me *back* to the townsmen *hopeful* still in woe who sent me out with fresh hopes bright of face.

The Greek of the words italicized is supplied in a foot note.

Of the four sentences for Greek prose this is one specimen:

4. Consider this, my friends, and reflect seriously in your minds, that to-day it is not the law that is on trial, touching its fitness and unfitness; but you yourselves are under examination as to whether you are fit to receive kindnesses from others for the future, or no.

LATIN ELEGIACS.

All nature smiles to meet the coming Spring,
 But I am sad—my heart alone is sore.
 I cannot take delight in anything,
 Because my darling Chloris is no more.

And three other similar verses.

ALGEBRA.

There are ten questions given, of which two are transcribed:

5. Prove that the sum of the cubes of any three consecutive numbers is divisible by three times the middle number.

9. Prove that $n(n-1)$ is the number of permutations of n things two at a time.

In how many ways could a crew of four men and a coxswain be selected from a ship's company of twenty-five men?

GEOMETRY.

Nine propositions from each of the 6 books of Euclid are given with riders upon them—*e. g.*:

4. The opposite angles of any quadrilateral figure inscribed in a circle are together equal to two right angles.

Prove the converse of this proposition.

6. To inscribe a circle in a given triangle. Describe a circle which will touch one side of the triangle, and the other two sides produced.

9. A circle described round an equilateral triangle, and from any point in the circumference straight lines are drawn to the angular points of the triangle, show that one of these straight lines is equal to the other two together.

If a scientific scholarship be the object of the candidate's hopes, he is presented with a paper on physical geography, and then with one upon botany or chemistry, according to his choice.

PHYSICAL GEOGRAPHY.

1. During what part of a month is the Moon visible in the heavens at midnight?

5. To what extent are valleys made by the streams which flow in them?

7. Give the names, as far as you can, of the larger animals now found wild in this country. Name any which have been exterminated by man, and also any which existed wild in pre-historic times, but have become extinct.

8. State what you know of the natural history of the following products, and the parts of the world from which we derive them: Sugar, cotton, coffee, ivory, dates, rice, mahogany, teak and India-rubber.

This is half the paper.

BOTANY.

4. Schedule the leaf specimen A, pointing out the arrangement of the leaves, their forms, venation, vernation and stipulation, and the character of their surface and margin.

5. Describe the fruit specimen B, pointing out the number and arrangement of the carpels, the placentation, mode of dehiscence and other peculiarities it presents.

6. Schedule the flower in the specimen C, noting its form of inflorescence. Refer it as far as the specimen admits to its class, sub-class and family, stating the character on which you rely.

CHEMISTRY.

1. You may ask for the materials requisite for preparing ammonium nitrate (in solution), obtain a small portion of the salt in a solid state. What would be the result of heating the solid salt?

3. The powder marked D, is a metallic oxide, determine it by means of the blow-pipe.

5. Find the metal and acid in the simple salt marked H.

The other two questions are similar concerning metals and acids, specimens of which were given.

For the French scholarship two papers, one in translation the second in grammar and composition, are given in addition to the first six papers. The first paper consists of four paragraphs. A score of lines from a poet, an equal quantity from a prose writer. If the boy had

ever seen either it must indeed have been as he would have probably said, "a big fluke."

The condition of his knowledge of the language which his examiner expects may probably be gauged by the third paragraph, which is:

Translate:

1. A mon insu.
2. Partir de ce pas.
3. Sens dessus-dessous.
4. A bon chat bon rat.
5. Tirer à qui mieux mieux.
6. Il m'en sut gré.
7. Il n'en peut mais.
8. Pour peu qu'il s'excuse.
9. Comme vous voilà fait!
10. Ce n'est pas là mon fait.
11. Bâtir des châteaux en Espagne.
12. Vous avez beau vous en défendre.
13. Il a beaucoup de savoir vivre
14. Je vous le donne en dix!

The fourth is a philosophic paragraph to be translated into French.

FRENCH GRAMMAR AND COMPOSITION.

2. Different meanings of the following, according as they are masculine or feminine: Garde, critique, trompette, poêle, vase, pendule.

3. Give meaning and Latin derivation of forfait, aîne, aubépine, faite à huis clos, à mi-côte, à l'affût, de prime saut.

6. Give by complete instances four different constructions requiring subjunctive mood in French.

9. Put into idiomatic French:

1. I owe him a grudge.
3. He's a perfect gentleman.
4. He is five years older than I am.
5. You have nothing to complain of.
6. He took me unawares.
7. Let's walk home arm in arm.

I can well understand that any one who has not had

reason to consider this subject might after a perusal of these papers, say, the standard was abnormal—that it was preposterous to expect any but prodigies to do anything like justice to such papers, and that even if a boy could be prepared so as to creditably acquit himself, it must be at the expense of health and all that is most loved in the boyishness of a boy.

But this is not the case—by carefully utilizing all the means of education—and bringing them to bear upon a boy for the seven years of his life between seven and fourteen. Then, providing the boy possess more than the average of intellectual ability, he will of a certainty take a public school scholarship. And surely even if a scholarship be not obtained, and there are not more than five or six given by each school; if this standard be found possible, high as it is, it is the duty of every parent to provide that the most shall be made of every element which goes to build up the character of his son, and every parent, by the opportunity granted, should and would have a care that the boy shall have his feet upon that ladder whose top is the highest possible.

To a comparative looker-on, a great opportunity appears to be open to the Church in this country; wealth is accruing to the seats of learning; this means that a living can be procured by devotion to study—and those best and earliest prepared will carry off the prizes. Why should not the Church be foremost in establishing preparatory schools? The system has been carefully elaborated, and nothing is wanted but a conscientious adherence to it. The Rector of the parish should personally superintend its carrying out, and himself teach two or three lessons daily and sign the weekly reports. If I find, from the readers of this article that others share my opinion, and if the editor affords the opportunity, I shall be happy to describe so in detail the working of a preparatory school—that the successful management of one will be a simple matter. Not only will income accrue, not only will real and serviceable work for CHRIST be done, but a nursery for the right sort of clergymen will be established. Everybody seems to believe that a great

future is close before this Church, and if so, the right sort of men must be provided for the work, or the harvest will not be gathered. The Church in England has to thank the preparatory schools for the supply of her ministers. I can only recall one preparatory school whose head is not in Orders. The boys who are destined to take the lead in the foremost of the race, from their earliest years, are in contact with clerical life. The greatest man in the boy's kingdom is a clergyman. Imperceptibly with his notion of the highest is mixed the clerical. He goes to the public school. The head master is again a clergyman. Most probably his house master is one too, and his wife a clergyman's daughter. He reaches the sixth form and here he discovers by personal contact that the doctor is a Christian as well as a clergyman. There are thousands of leading men to-day who yet can feel the hand of an Arnold, or a Temple, or a Butler, or a Longley, or a Tait, or a Benson, laid upon their shoulder and can yet hear the single sentence of a great man, the never-dying memory of which "took their feet from the mire and clay and set them upon the Rock." This is the rich and succulent soil into which the great Church of England strikes down her rootlets, and so long as she keeps thus her influence in the Preparatory and Public Schools, so long will she command the best intellect of the country.

If such Preparatory Schools were established in this country, they would educate the sons of the best class; they would be out of the way of the public schools, for they would take boys only from seven to fifteen; they would have a different system of instruction; their classes would never contain more than twelve boys—the graduation being so regular that a boy could rise from one class to another in mid-term, and, according to his work, make his way continuously up, and then and above all, the grand distinction would be that here religion was recognized as a necessary element of education.

Happy the school whose masters having themselves the consciousness of GOD's presence, lead their pupils to live under the same fear. This alone is the true founda-

tion upon which to train a character. "The fear of the LORD is the beginning of wisdom"—not of knowledge—but of the application of knowledge to life. To increase only in knowledge is to assimilate to Satan, but to imbue knowledge with love, to use knowledge for its object in educating that which is in the boy, and enabling him to keep captive every thought and coerce his will; and to do this under the eye of the Master and because it is His service. This would be an acquisition beyond all value to a boy.

The morning chapel, where the lesson from the Great Book is applied to his school life, the serious and earnest work in class, the Sunday Greek Testament lesson, the Monday morning "Scripture lesson," the application to his faults of that which S. Paul said was "of God unto Salvation"—a continually present and ever increasing force, and then the aid of religion to help him to rise from a fall. For the chief glory of God is shown in Redemption, so the great opportunity of a master is in correction. Then the Church's formulas he becomes familiar with—The Prayer Book, the Catechism, the choir service, all tending in the same direction; so in the end it would be strange if the boy did not leave the school an intelligent member of the Church.

The environment is advantageous for all these influences happily to affect him. It is quite possible to keep the moral atmosphere of a preparatory school without taint, for a young boy tells the story of his moral condition, both in his work and in his face; that all is not right can be detected at once. A kind talk will soon discover the evil and to be aware of it is the chief item in its correction. Though *sneaking* is an aversion to boys, still the proper definition of this offence ought so frequently to be given that it takes its place in the school traditions. That which a master ought to be able to discover for himself—the breaking of the school rules, the copying of a sum, the unfair use of a crib, etc., to tell of this is sneaking. But it is the duty of every boy to report the wrong word, the bad story, the immodest act. If the older boys are enlisted in the detection of

that which the presence of a master would at once arrest, and which therefore no master can discover, a moral atmosphere will be soon created, and it will be so permeating and so general that no new boy can vitiate it, but will the rather succumb to its influence.

Thus under the wing of the Church a number of the boys of the best families will be in constant training. A great opportunity will be afforded of making the most of time and tide. The influence of the Church in the best direction will be extended—the income of the Church will be increased—and she will be carrying out in something like an effective way—the LORD'S distinct command.—“Feed my Lambs.”

H. MARTYN HART.

THE PRAYER BOOK OF THE CHRISTIAN CATHOLIC CHURCH OF SWITZERLAND.

1. *Livre de Prières Liturgiques à L'Usage des Catholiques-Chrétiens de la Suisse.* Approuvé par le Synode National, réuni à Bâle, dans sa séance du 9, Juin, 1881. Genève; 1881.

2. *Gebetbuch der Christkatholischen Kirche der Schweiz. Zweite Auflage.* Bern; 1884.

IN the AMERICAN CHURCH REVIEW, for January 1881, we gave, in two articles, one on the Daily Prayers and Vesper Service, the other on the Eucharistic Office, a review of the Prayer Book of the Christian Catholic Church of Switzerland, then, as now, under the charge of the able and devoted Bishop Herzog, whose acquaintance many of us had the happiness of making at the General Convention of 1880. It was shown, in these articles, how closely the Swiss *Gebetbuch* reflected the spirit of genuine Catholicity, and if the desirability of certain enrichments in this Liturgy (to use the word in its wider sense), was pointed out, there was good ground for hoping that some of these, at least, would ere long be made.

One of the most important additions mentioned as requisite to be made was the compilation of a suitable Lectionary. In the *Livre de Prières Liturgiques*, the French version of the *Gebetbuch*, translated by the curé of Geneva, M. B. Vimeux, with the cordial sanction of his Bishop, and approved by the Christian Catholic Synod at Basle, June 9th, 1881, only five months after the appearance of the articles mentioned in the CHURCH REVIEW, there was added a table of Lessons for Morning

and Evening Prayer on the Sundays and chief Holy Days throughout the year, and a selection of "meditations," taken from Holy Scripture, for each day of the month. These latter, intended for use at Evening Prayer, consist of eight or ten verses from different parts of Scripture. The meditation for the first day of the month has for its subject "the Love of God," and is made up of S. Matt. xxii. 37; 1 John iii. 18; S. John xiv. 15, 21; Ps. lxxiii. 25. The third day of the month the subject considered is "Faith," and the passages of Scripture are Rom. x. 9-14; S. James iii. 14, 17, 24. 26; S. Mark ix. 23, 24. On other days, the Scripture passages treat of such subjects as "Love of our neighbor," "Humility," "Distrust of self," "The duty of bearing the Cross." The Revised Version of the *Gebetbuch*, just issued, carries the matter further, and provides lessons from the Old and New Testaments, not only for the Sundays and chief Holy Days, but also for the week days throughout the year. In one of our articles * are these words of Dr. Siegmund, whose loss to the Church we so mourned when he was laid aside two years since by disease, from the work he was so admirably carrying on, and who has so lately been called to his rest. "No Church," he writes, "which is undertaking this [the compilation of a lectionary] at present, should imitate the inconsistency of our TABLE OF LESSONS, which has one order of proper lessons, beautifully agreeing with the Christian year, and another here and there overlapping the former, and following, from mere indifference, the natural year." We cannot but think that there is much force in these words, and that when daily prayers in church become the *rule* rather than the *exception*, the incongruity between the lessons for Sunday and those for the following days of the week will be so felt, that we shall have lessons provided for all the seasons of the Christian year, as we already have for Lent. In the recent edition of the *Gebetbuch*, something of this kind is provided. The subjects of the week days of the Advent season are, for the several weeks, "The SAVIOUR expected," "A SAVIOUR necessary," "The Divinity of the SAVIOUR," "The characteristics of the

* *American Church Review*, Jan. 1881, p. 33.

SAVIOUR." For Christmas week, "The manifestation of GOD's love to man," thence onward to Epiphany, "CHRIST's obedience to the law." For the week days of the Epiphany season, and indeed until Lent, the New Testament lessons treat of the *life* of JESUS. For Lenten week days, the subject for the first half of the season is "Health and salvation in CHRIST," from mid-lent, "The story of CHRIST's sufferings." And so throughout the year.

Another point which seemed of no little practical importance, was referred to in one of the articles in our REVIEW. In the translation of the Eucharistic Service of the Christian Catholic Church of Switzerland, there given, after what concerned the reception by the celebrant, came this rubric: *For the Communion of the Faithful, see the Ritual.* On this the remark was made, (p. 39). "Where it has long been customary to have many Celebrations of the Holy Eucharist, and but few Communion, it must needs take time for the habit of frequent Communion, in accordance with primitive usage, to be established. It is to be hoped, however, that ere long, instead of directions respecting Communion being relegated to the Ritual, the Eucharistic Office itself may be so arranged as to make it evident that, in the minds of those in authority in the Christian Catholic Church of Switzerland, the Communion of the Faithful is a normal part of every Eucharistic Celebration."

In the *Livre de Prières Liturgiques*, published in 1881, the rubric corresponds with that we have from the first edition of the *Gebetbuch*. But in the revised edition of the *Gebetbuch*, after the Priest has received, the rubric bids:

¶ *Hereupon he administers the Communion to the faithful, and after the following manner: He turns to the people, and holding up the consecrated Host he says in a loud voice :*

Come unto Me all ye that travail and are heavy laden, and I will refresh you.

Then thrice :

O LORD I am not worthy that Thou shouldest come under my roof, but speak the word only and my soul shall be healed.

¶ *At the administration of the Communion :*

The Body of Our LORD JESUS CHRIST preserve thy soul unto everlasting life. Amen.

The Blood of Our LORD JESUS CHRIST preserve thy soul unto everlasting life. Amen.

¶ *After the Communion :*

What we have partaken with the mouth, that let us with a pure mind receive, and from this temporal reception may we have eternal redemption.

Let Thy Body, O LORD, of which I have partaken, and Thy Blood which I have drunk, abide in my soul, and grant that after this refreshment, through this Holy Sacrament, no spot of sin may remain in me. Amen.

Then follow certain concluding prayers, and the blessing, which need not be repeated here, as they were given on pages 60 and 61 of the *CHURCH REVIEW* for January 1881. For occasions of a *General Communion*, there are special prayers appointed, which may be used before and after the administration. One of the latter the Church owes to the piety of Archbishop Laud. The Archbishop's original is in Latin. It may be translated as follows, with a slight change introduced by Bishop Herzog:

Loving FATHER, we pray Thee humbly for Thine Holy Catholic Church. Fill it with all truth, and in all truth with all peace, cleanse it where it is corrupted, guide it where it is in error, enlighten it where it is in darkness, turn it to the right where it has fallen into superstition, correct it where it is in fault, confirm and strengthen it where it is in the right. Where anything is lacking to it, restore it unto it. Where it is sundered and divided, heal its rents and unite it.

We pray Thee for this, O Thou Holy One of Israel, Through JESUS CHRIST Our LORD. Amen.

This admirable prayer, we may mention, has long been commended, by the Anglo-Continental Society, to the use of its members.

In the last edition of the *Gebetbuch*, is given a form of Thanksgiving to be used at the conclusion of the Eucharistic Service, as follows :

Priest. The LORD be with you.

People. And with Thy spirit.

Priest. The beginning of the Holy Gospel according to S. John.

People. Glory be to Thee, O LORD.

Priest. In the beginning was the Word * * * full of grace and truth. S. John i. 1-14.

People. Thanks be to the LORD.

Priest. Let us pray.

O GOD Whose mercies cannot be numbered, and whose goodness is an unceasing fountain of blessing, we give thanks to Thy Majesty, so full of kindness, for all the benefits that Thou hast done unto us, and we beseech Thee, of Thy great goodness, that Thou wouldest never leave us, but wouldest bring us to those good things which are eternal, Through JESUS CHRIST OUR LORD. Amen.

As regards the comfortable words: "Come unto Me," etc., in the Ritual, as published in 1879, there stood, in its place, the words: "Behold the Lamb of GOD Which taketh away the sin of the world." Bishop Herzog told the writer of this paper, some years since, that, understanding that these words, used just before the Administration of the Holy Communion, were taken by some as affirming the doctrine of Transubstantiation, which they were not at all meant to do, he would have them changed in a second edition. Under the circumstances the change is surely for the better.

In the new edition of the *Gebetbuch*, the Offices for Holy Baptism, for Confirmation, for Holy Matrimony, for The Burial of Infants, and for The Burial of Adults, have been inserted from the "Ritual." This, too, is a gain, for many more of the Laity would have the *Gebetbuch* than would procure the "Ritual." And all should be able to take part intelligently in these services.

It would seem that among the Christian Catholics of Switzerland there has not been always as much care exercised as there might well have been, to have Divine service rendered in a manner duly impressive. Bishop Herzog is fully alive to the importance of making the Church service edifying to those who take part in it, and attractive to those who are without, and who might be won to it. With the aid of a friend skilled in harmony, he has had the Evening Prayer duly set to music. The

Sunday Evensong in his Church in Berne has been for some time fully choral. The good Bishop was desirous of adding to the small collection of hymns in the *Gebetbuch* a number of other hymns, with fitting tunes. So soon as his wish was known in this country, a contribution toward this object was sent him by a few friends. It was not received in time to enable him to print these hymns with the *Gebetbuch*, but we understand that they will appear before long in a small supplementary volume. The Christian Catholic *Gebetbuch* was a good prayer book in 1879. In its revised form it is a better one in 1884, with God's blessing we may look for the introduction, in a near future, of such further improvements and enrichments as to make it truly admirable. With the Swiss, as with us, there are diversities of tastes and of views, the work of enriching a liturgy, with them as with us, demands time, and care, and study. Bishop Herzog deservedly has the esteem and love of his Clergy and Laity. But for all this, and all the more because of this, he will not try, now that they have so good a *Gebetbuch*, to introduce further enrichments which would add to its value, until this can be done with the general concurrence of Clergy and Laity throughout the Christian Catholic Church of Switzerland.

The writer takes this opportunity of saying that, by some accident, in his article on the *Eucharistic Office of the Christian Catholic Church of Switzerland*, in the AMERICAN CHURCH REVIEW, for January, 1881, the two prayers from the *Missale Romanum*, (p. 62), beginning "DOMINE JESU CHRISTE," and "Perceptio Corporis Tui," with the corresponding prayers from the *Gebetbuch* beginning "O LORD JESUS CHRIST" and "The participation of Thy Body and Blood," were accountably misplaced. They should have stood on page 59, the former before the rubric: *Genuflectit, surgit, et dicit*, the latter before the words: "I will take the Bread of Heaven."

CHARLES R. HALE.

CHRIST'S BLESSINGS IN THE CHURCH.

In some notes upon the admirable Report of the Joint Committee on Enrichment (see N.Y. *Churchman* of Jan. 12th, 1884), a specimen of the following Office was given in contrast with that of the Beatitudes, proposed by the Committee. In accordance with the desire since expressed the whole is here given:

CHRIST'S BLESSINGS IN THE CHURCH.

¶ *To be sung or said after the Collect for Grace, Morning or Evening, in the usual place of the Litany; or at other times.*

¶ *If this Office be used, by itself, the Priest, or other Minister, shall begin, all kneeling.*

LORD, have mercy upon us.

Ans. CHRIST, have mercy upon us.

LORD, have mercy upon us.

Our Father, etc.

Amen.

¶ *Then shall he stand up, the People still kneeling, and turn him to the People, and go on with the following part of the Office: but note that, if this Office be used with Matins or Evensong, then he shall leave off the LORD'S Prayer, and the little Litany which goes before it, and begin here: he alone standing and turning him to the People:*

Min. These blessings Our LORD JESUS CHRIST spake to His Disciples:

Ans. Incline mine ear to hear the wondrous things of Thy Word: and draw my heart to do Thy will, O GOD.

Min. Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.

Ans. Give me neither beggary nor riches; feed me with food convenient for me: lest I be full and deny thee, or lest I be in want and steal, and take the name of my GOD in vain.

Min. Blessed are they that mourn: for they shall be comforted.

Ans. LORD, send to us the HOLY GHOST, the Comforter: leave us not comfortless; come Thou to us, O LORD.

Min. Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth.

Ans. Make us to be meek in spirit, O LORD GOD: that we may possess our lot, and be refreshed in the multitude of peace.

Min. Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness; for they shall be filled.

Ans. LORD, feed us with that living Bread; which cometh down from heaven.

Min. Blessed are the merciful; for they shall obtain mercy.

Ans. Teach me to deliver the poor when he crieth, the fatherless, the widow, and him that hath no helper; so let Thy loving mercy come also unto me, O Lord.

Min. Blessed are the pure in heart; for they shall see GOD.

Ans. O, cleanse Thou me from secret faults, and keep me from presumptuous sins. So I shall be undefiled; mine eyes shall see the King in His beauty. I shall be like my LORD, when I shall see Him as He is.

Min. Blessed are the peace-makers; for they shall be called the children of GOD.

Ans. Give more grace, O my LORD; that I may seek peace, alway, and ensue it, and may be evermore the child of GOD, our Father who is in heaven.

Min. Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness's sake: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.

Ans. Help them to right, O LORD, that suffer wrong. Send forth Thy light and truth to lead them unto Thy holy hill and to Thy dwelling; even to the Altar of GOD, the GOD that giveth joy and gladness.

Min. Blessed are ye when men shall revile you;

Ans. Keep Thou my lips; that I repay not railing with railing;

Min. And when they shall persecute you;

Ans. That I give not back evil to them that give evil: but, in its stead, give blessing;

Min. And when they shall say all manner of evil against you, falsely, for My sake;

Ans. Hold Thou me near, that I deny Thee not, LORD JESUS; nor be ashamed of Thee or of Thy Word.

Min. Rejoice ye, in that day;

Ans. Quicken us, and we will rejoice in Thee; our songs will we make in Thy name.

Min. And be ye exceeding glad;

Ans. We will be glad in Thee; yea, exceeding glad will we be of Thy salvation.

Min. For great is your reward in heaven.

Ans. In Thy presence is fulness of joy; at Thy right hand are pleasures forevermore; and Thou wilt show me the path of life. Amen.

Min. Let us remember those other words of the LORD JESUS, how He said: It is more blessed to give than to receive.

Ans. Open our eyes to see Thee in the least and neediest of Thy members, and warm our hearts, that we may freely give; as we have received freely, O LORD JESUS.

Min. The LORD be ever with you.

Ans. The LORD be ever with thy spirit.

Min. Let us pray.

¶ *Here the Minister shall kneel where the Minister kneeleth in the Litany.*

A Collect for Grace to follow CHRIST.

O God of all might and goodness, whose well-beloved SON, our LORD, while He dwelt here, in our flesh, went among men doing good in the healing of them that were diseased, and them that were vexed of the devil, and the giving of light to them that sat in darkness and the shadow of death, and, after that He had gone up to Thy right hand, did shed forth, in the Church, the HOLY GHOST, grant to us grace that we, by the HOLY GHOST, be led after our LORD's example; that we may follow in His steps, and, at the last, be set, at His right hand, among the chosen. Grant this for the same Thy SON, JESUS CHRIST's sake. Amen.

The blessing of the LORD, Almighty and most merciful, be upon us and upon the whole Catholic Church of CHRIST, both now and evermore. Amen.

ROBERT LOWELL.

CHRISTIANITY'S RELATIONS TO GOD'S SPIRITUAL KINGDOM, AND HIS MATERIAL CREATION.

M. RENAN, in his volume on *Les Origines Du Christianisme*, has tried to account for the origin of Christianity on the Pagan theory, on which the ancient Mythologies originated. But he has failed to show any knowledge of it as a revelation from God, as a component part of His works of Creation and Redemption, and His Spiritual Kingdom; and that as a system of religion, it was a spiritual out growth, or first fruit of Creation, adapted to man's nature, and a power to develop mankind, in their gradual enlightenment and progress to a higher spiritual condition, than the one in which man was created.

It was in the beginning, and ever since has been, more than the science of right living, and has always had reference to something beyond man's present earthly life. It is the bond which binds man to God, by a spiritual life, and laws given to teach him how to retain the innocence in which he was created, or to attain righteousness after he had lost his innocence, and finally to become in some measure holy like God, in a temporal life and world, and to fit him to be translated to an eternal life in God's Spiritual Kingdom. Any other view of Religion, and God has revealed no other but Christianity, is without any foundation confirmed by history or by man's experience.

It is said, that there is a coming Scientific Religion, but this is not so. It has already come. For six thousand years Christianity has been steadily coming, ever since the SON of GOD promised His Incarnation in the seed of the Woman.

And it is now yearly coming into a clearer recognition

of its scientific character as physical science advances, and it enables us to understand its more subtle spiritual laws, and their connections with its rites and sacraments. And now we begin to see that its laws constitute the grandest part of Science as it is known to GOD.

And if there be any reliance to be put on the history of Religion, as it comes to us through a professed revelation from GOD, and human records, and of the origin of idolatry, and the mythologies invented by men, it is certain that the latter were degenerations from the former, which originated after the dispersion of mankind from the plains of Shinar.

All the surviving ancient records and monuments prove, that in the next generations true religion rapidly declined, and that idolatry and polytheism, and the deification of men prevailed everywhere but in the one line chosen by GOD, in the Patriarchs and in the Hebrew Theocracy, to preserve and transmit His truth and promises, and revelations until CHRIST came.

Mythology is a human conception, and a corruption of the revealed Personality of the one true and Almighty GOD. It is impossible that such a system could have been invented had not the knowledge of the true GOD preceded it. It is self evident, from all the known history of true and false religions, that Mythology was a degradation of a true theology, and that theology was not an ascent from that.

All those systems were invented in the Ante-Christos Dark Ages, who "when they knew GOD glorified him not as GOD, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools and changed the glory of the incorruptible GOD into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things. Wherefore GOD also gave them up to uncleanness. * * * Who changed the truth of GOD into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed forever."

And that was written nineteen centuries ago, by a

scholar well versed in the world's history, and who then had sources of knowledge which have since perished.

Indeed not only revealed religion, but Christianity was coeval with man's creation, and is as scientific as creation by its relations to it, as astronomy, and chemistry, are by their relations to it. Were it not so, it would not be adapted to man's faith or condition; for none could believe in a religion which did not accord with the revelation God had made in nature, and which constitutes a part of His plan in the creation of matter and of man. And this is exactly what Christianity has done from man's creation, and is now doing, by its adaptation to the new knowledge and power it has diffused among men.

Any man's opinions on Christianity are of little value, who could deliberately write as M. Rénan has that, "Nothing is more false than the exegesis which could find Christianity graven between the lines of the Old Testament." Or who could say that "The rejection of the supernatural has become an absolute dogma for cultivated minds." And that, "Between Science and Christianity warfare is inevitable, and that one of the two must succumb." And that "Christianity will be overthrown unless it retires from its hopeless position of belief in the supernatural." Because Christianity is graven in the Old Testament from its announcement in Genesis, until Malachi declared it to be coming in the Sun of Righteousness, and it was prepared for by John the Baptist. And because for one Agnostic, who rejects the supernatural, there are millions of Pagans and Christians who accept it. And because so far from being a conflict between Science and Christianity, they were never before seen in such accord. And because his prophecy of the overthrow of Christianity, unless it gives up the supernatural, is seen to be weak and false, by its ever increasing spread over the earth, and dominion over the best and most enlightened minds. And all these well known facts show, how utterly worthless such opinions are of the credence of any but a mind darkened and bewildered by its cultivated unbelief.

S. Anselm said, "Faith must precede the attempt to understand, and what is believed must be surely believed,

although not yet understood. And should efforts to understand prove unsuccessful, as must sometimes be the case owing to the depth of the Divine mysteries, the obligation to believe still remains."

There is a vital relation between Religion and man's developing life, and its wonderful adaptation to every generation from Noah to our day, as doubtless there was from Adam to Noah, and as it is now seen to be adapted not only to the present generation, but opening up new vistas into the "eternal life, which God, who cannot lie, promised before the world began." Titus i., 3. Thus its perfect adaptation to man's nature, and revealed destiny, proves that it was from the GOD who created him.

Religion is a science, or system of laws, that in its first stage was designed not only to secure man's earthly good, but also to save him from his evil spiritual enemy. And so long as he conformed to it he could see, and talk with GOD, and enjoy His presence. It was an exotic introduced on earth from Heaven, and a branch Church from that same Church S. John beheld in vision at Patmos, the new Jerusalem adorned as a bride, but not a new church, but a seed from Heaven that planted in Eden would fill the earth.

It was of a supernatural origin, and its growth was to be spiritual, or by a supernatural means. And it was provided by GOD, in anticipation of the spiritual evil He knew would be introduced into the world by His enemy the Devil.

Without the knowledge of sin man would not have known righteousness; and without the death penalty there would have been no provision for his resurrection in a spiritual body. When Satan accomplishes GOD's purposes his power to do evil will be destroyed.

Eden was an enclosure from the outside world, the Church where the SON of GOD personally met man, and told him of his duty of faith and obedience, and of the penalty that would follow unbelief and disobedience. That Church was the root of Christianity, and it was designed to pass through several stages of development, each one scientific, before it attained maturity.

The first stage was under the covenant of faith and obedience; so long as that continued man could have personal relations with the SON of GOD; while he was innocent, he could see, and hear, and talk with Him.

But as soon as man disobeyed, when GOD came and he heard His voice, he was afraid and hid himself. He could no longer look on GOD, and He withdrew His visible presence, but readapted Religion to his altered condition. He made the new covenant of sacrifice, by which he could be restored to GOD's favor, through faith in the promise of a SAVIOUR who would come through the seed of the Woman, and make mankind more spiritual, and fit them to again live in GOD's presence in spiritual worlds.

Sin, like Religion, was an exotic introduced into this world by a spiritual being from a spiritual world, and did not originate with man, who was created good, that is innocent, but he had no righteousness, for that comes from doing right in resisting evil. And man was so created that he must learn good through evil before he could obtain righteousness, and become more like GOD than he was originally created. And that knowledge of good and evil includes all things as they are known to GOD, all that He has ever done, or said, or revealed through CHRIST of His life and nature so far as man can attain it.

The Psalmist said, three thousand years ago, "it is GOD who teacheth man Science!" and Science as known to GOD, includes all the laws of the created and spiritual worlds; and as known to man, it embraces all he can learn of GOD's revelations in His works, words, and life as it is revealed to us in the nature of JESUS CHRIST, and the Psalmist said also, "Blessed is the man whom GOD teacheth."

The class of scientists now, who vainly imagine that the Bible is no revelation from GOD, and who do not study it, because they suppose it is all supernatural, and has nothing scientific in it, do find their unbelief refuted on its first page, which declares how Creation, that contains all that they hold as Science, had a supernatural origin, and all physical laws were the result, and there the nodes of the laws of the spiritual and natural worlds

unite, and every man since born has had in him a continuity of those laws. And as this is GOD's teaching, any who refuse to hear it are only wise in their own conceit.

GOD tells us the carnal mind is enmity to Him, and that it cannot discern spiritual things, and that it is only by doing His will that men can know whether his revelations be true, and "without faith it is impossible to please" Him. It is not therefore to be expected that GOD will reveal an understanding of His laws to men who refuse to believe them to be His revelation.

The Agnostic doctrine, that the unknowable belongs only to what they call supernatural things, is refuted by every stage of investigation of natural laws; because the unknowable exists there as well as in the spiritual ones. The law of the motions of the heavenly bodies is known, but they do not know the cause of the motion; the law of gravitation is known, but they do not know what gravity is, and so of a thousand minor laws. They are compelled to go to the Bible to learn how Creation began, who created it, and even His name and nature. Whoever refuses to do this is self-sufficient and arrogant, and inevitably drifts into Pantheism and Materialism. S. Paul knew this, and warned Timothy to avoid "profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of Science falsely so called." And this degradation always follows, whether the descent be from evangelical parentage, or by hereditament from successive generations of infidels.

And it is an error of theologians, as well as of that class of scientists, who deny that Religion belongs to another domain than Science; were it so the human body of CHRIST would be excluded.

Spiritual laws are as positive, and vastly more universal than natural laws, they reach beyond them to GOD, and to His invisible eternal kingdom; and our knowledge of spiritual things is increased by investigating them, as much as physical knowledge is perfected by investigating natural laws. The spiritual laws are of a higher kind, because they are eternal, while the physical laws are temporary, for it is admitted that waste is going on in some of the laws, and changes that intimate the possibility of

their destruction. There is no such possibility intimated in spiritual laws.

The creation of matter and its forces and laws was the first revelation GOD made of His power and wisdom outside of His spiritual kingdom. And law pertains to Religion as much as it does to matter and force, because it is the result of both spiritual and physical forces, that is of faith and obedience.

Natural and spiritual laws are the two divisions of Science, and in their unity comprise its whole so far as it is known to man, and there is a union of them in man's body, soul, and spirit; and they can not be disjoined without dissevering what GOD has joined together.

Creation was supernatural in its origin, a projection from GOD's spiritual kingdom. After the general statement, that GOD created the heavens and the earth, later writers give some details. The Psalmist says, "By the word of the LORD the heavens were made; and all the host of them by the breath of His mouth;" and that He gave the solar system its motion through space, and laid the foundations of the earth. And Job says, "GOD settled the mountains from the dust, and gave the winds and waters their circuits," and tells how the fossil kingdom was formed. And S. Paul confirms their testimony, saying, "The worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear." Though all was miraculous it was by a natural exercise of GOD's power.

Man's creation was supernatural, by his formation from elementary matter, and after his body and soul were created GOD breathed into them an immortal spirit, and he became a living, rational and intelligent person. The natural and supernatural laws made him an immortal man, "of the lowest form of life in the spiritual world," so far as it is known to us. He is only an embryo, hidden as yet in his earthly chrysalis case" * * but "even as an embryo it contains some property of its future glory." By the breath of GOD man's spirit unites him to Him, and will fit him to live in spiritual worlds.

And his spirit is independent of matter, and of his ma-

terial body, and can exist without them. He has desires beyond them, he is conscious of his immortality, and one of his earliest longings is to know who, and what, and where God is. The feeling is universal. All the heathen believe in some kind of a god, feel a sense of guilt, and use some means to obtain his pardon.

All things were given to man in a mystery, because they would be developed in the course of time, and help to develop man so that he would finally see his own wonderful relations to God, and to the universe, and the reasons he has to adore His wisdom and goodness.

The visible world was the staging to introduce the great work of Redemption. Matter was essential for man's creation, and man was essential for the SON of GOD's Incarnation. The fall of man by an evil spirit was essential for the introduction of the HOLY SPIRIT, to finish the work of Creation and Redemption. And the mortal death of man was essential for his resurrection to a spiritual and eternal life.

The second stage of Religion was one of carnal ordinances, and sacrifice remitted sin because of the faith and obedience, which looked onward to the seed of the Woman, whose blood-shedding gave sacrifice its efficacy, and was a legal righteousness that made the person acceptable to God. It was for a long time a mystery who this seed of the Woman would be.

But promises of God and prophecies gradually revealed it. That covenant lasted from Adam to Abram when Circumcision was added to it, and man's blood was a further type of the blood of CHRIST, by which the atonement for sin was made. And it was a further revelation that by His blood, as the Son of Man, that the forgiveness of sins was obtained.

And for twenty-five centuries, until the next historical change was made by God at Sinai, the first born son in every family was a Priest to offer the sacrifice, and an antetype of God's only begotten SON, to be Incarnate, and from whom all priesthoods was, and is derived.

And a flood of light not only blazed out on Mount Sinai, when the SON of God came there to reorganize the

Church and the priesthood, but it shone out into the world, in a theocratic Kingdom, with its three orders of rulers, making it a resemblance to GOD's kingdom in Heaven. And it was a clearer revelation of the doctrine of the most Holy Trinity than was ever before had. And a series of ordinances and holy days were appointed, to preserve and transmit the new truths that were revealed, and which were to prepare the way for the coming of the seed of the Woman.

The coming of the SON of GOD to give the law on Sinai, was the last stage of preparation He made to prepare His way to come personally, and perfect the Church, and give the Gospel. He said, "I proceeded and came forth from the FATHER." "He was the Life and the Life was the light of men." In him the laws of the spiritual and material worlds united. By His birth and death and resurrection the powers of the spiritual and material worlds were agitated; Angels were present on two occasions, and the darkened Sun and quaking earth testified to the other. In Him was the eternal life of GOD, and the death of all mankind. He came to give men such spiritual life and knowledge as they never before had. The Christian covenant was an outgrowth from the two former ones; and His spiritual kingdom was but the old theocracy developed to adapt it to a new order of spiritual things. This was first manifested at JESUS' baptism, when the HOLY GHOST descended on Him, and the FATHER's voice from Heaven testified, "This is My beloved SON, in Whom I am well pleased." He made water, which cleanses the body, a type of the spiritual washing that cleanses the spirit from sin and bread and wine to give man spiritual strength. And all His words and works were a series of acts or doctrines showing the intimate relations of material and spiritual laws and beings and worlds.

S. John says, "all things were made by the SON of GOD, and He was made flesh." "But as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of GOD," who were "born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of GOD." Therein is

the contact of man's spirit and soul, and body with CHRIST, through a new birth of water and the HOLY SPIRIT, which makes Him one with CHRIST, sacred humanity as He was one with GOD by His Divine nature.

The SON of GOD Incarnate in man, and having the HOLY SPIRIT abiding in Him, united in Him the laws of the spiritual and material worlds, so that He could convey His supernatural life to mankind, that sinners could be sanctified by it, and sinners and the righteous be raised from death by it at the Resurrection. And it is that union of the natural and spiritual laws of the visible and invisible universe, that makes Christianity a scientific religion. Indeed all the laws of the material universe seem to be only the outward and visible manifestations of the superior laws of the invisible kingdom of GOD, the shadows of the eternal spiritual substances there.

And those laws must be continuous throughout the created and uncreated kingdoms of GOD, because man's death does not dis sever him from them, JESUS' human nature with His Divine nature went to Paradise, and ascended to Heaven. Man's body here is subject to both natural and spiritual laws.

CHRIST's mission was to fulfil all the promises of GOD to man, in the development of Religion into its final spiritual state which we call Christianity. It is the reign of the HOLY SPIRIT on earth, the restoration of the Church to the visible condition, of its original invisible state in Paradise, by which the SON of GOD, as the CHRIST is present with His Church; and by which He has ever since been preparing for the Regeneration, when the material universe will again be good and changed to a spiritual condition. (Heb. i. 10, 11).

But to accomplish GOD's plans we now see, that it was needful that all things pertaining to man's redemption should be revealed in a mystery. Creation was a supernatural act, and the revelation that foretold its redemption had to be in a mystery, until the time was ready for its fulfilment.

Religion was adapted to man before he sinned; and after that it was readapted to his new state, and the seed

of the Woman was promised who would more than repair Satan's evil, and exalt man to a more spiritual life than the one he lost; and the Religion would gradually develop, and adapt itself to man's increasing understanding and wants, and at last bring him again into GOD's presence, from which sin had expelled him.

Divine wisdom and goodness so planned the works of creation and redemption, that their mystery should inspire man's curiosity to investigate their laws and thereby promote his temporal and spiritual well being.

Faith and obedience to the Law from Adam to CHRIST gave men a legal righteousness, as they now give by the Gospel the higher spiritual righteousness, which comes from a living faith in CHRIST.

The introduction of the spiritual kingdom of God into Creation, through His Incarnate SON, was a vastly higher exercise of His supernatural power than Creation. It was a manifestation of the Kingdom of Heaven, the coming of the seed of the Woman, the Redeemer of the world.

It partly unveiled the mystery of the Godhead, and of His design in the creation of the world and man, so that it was possible for sin to enter them, and to reveal what will be the final results of His works of creation and redemption.

Everything was revealed in mystery, because it was adapted to the changes mankind had to pass through of childhood and youth before they reached maturity, until the SON of GOD came and made men see what had been the necessity for it. CHRIST began to show the relations between the natural and spiritual worlds, and He continued it until it was finally manifested by His resurrection from death, and ascension to Heaven.

The Old Testament begins with the narrative of Creation, and of Satan's appearance to introduce sin and death; and the Gospel of S. John begins with the same account of Creation, and that all things were made by the SON of GOD, and that He met and conquered Satan, and introduced righteousness and eternal life to man.

The SON of GOD was Incarnate in JESUS as the SON of

Man, conceived by the HOLY GHOST, and He began a new race of mankind, an evolution from GOD, not a creation as Adam was. And He reformed the old kingdom of GOD, and changed its covenants to Baptism and the LORD'S Supper, and made them to convey spiritual life to men, by which they could overcome Satan, and fit themselves for a wholly spiritual body and life.

The unity of natural and spiritual laws, and their concert to accomplish GOD'S purposes are clearly seen in the life, and teaching, and works of CHRIST. And Science and Religion show by their joint relations their unity, and tend to glorify GOD and man. And it was not possible to know this until CHRIST came and revealed it; and He revealed it in a hidden way, that has gradually developed for nineteen centuries, until man had made such discoveries of natural laws as would enable him to interpret the spiritual ones, and now we see that Christianity is the crown of Science, because it includes the highest knowledge attainable of the nature of GOD, and of His works and words.

JESUS said, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit," and one birth is according to a natural law, and one is according to a spiritual law, and both take place in every Christian. And if man was created in GOD'S image and likeness this is reasonable. He lost the original righteousness in Adam, and GOD more than restored it in CHRIST, and when man completes the cycles of these lives he will return to GOD.

CHRIST'S teaching on these mysteries is positive, "I am the true vine, and my FATHER is the husbandman," * * * "I am the vine, and ye are the branches," and by abiding in Him His disciples could bring forth much fruit; and without Him they could do nothing.

Nothing was known of biology or embryology, in CHRIST'S day, and yet He showed that He knew all that has been learned in this generation, of the analogy between the conception and growth of both kinds of life, by the agency of water, and through a communication of antecedent life, each after its kind. For He calls the

second spiritual birth being born "from above," by the water and the SPIRIT. And nothing could more plainly teach the relations of the two kinds of laws in giving the two kinds of life, and it is really a scientific test.

The spiritual birth seems the greater mystery only because we do not know the nature of spiritual substance; and that probably caused CHRIST's question to Nicodemus, "If I have told you earthly things and ye did not believe, how shall ye believe if I tell you of heavenly things?" And it looks as if there were a perfect understanding by CHRIST, of the correspondence between the two kinds of laws, and that all that belonged to both were well known to Him. And He is a microcosm of the material and spiritual universe; His human nature belongs to the material part, and His Divine nature belongs to God's spiritual kingdom; and in His parables and miracles He revealed many of the relations of the natural and spiritual worlds.

The two mightiest natural forces are attraction and repulsion, they give stability and order to the material universe; and God's and Satan's are the corresponding living forces in the spiritual world, by which the forces of good and evil are mysteriously correlated, and the order and harmony of the spiritual world is maintained, against the evil and disorder existing there.

And though the laws of both kingdoms are after their kinds, yet in many ways they interpenetrate, and at man's death the material of his body enters into one kingdom, and his spirit passes into the spiritual worlds of Paradise, or Tartarus. S. Luke, 23. 42, 33; S. Peter 2. 4; and moreover all that pertained to CHRIST's humanity, passed its supernatural change from flesh to spirit, without going through the decay of returning to the elements, and is in the Godhead in Heaven. These laws are not a consequence of the nature of matter or spirit, but enactments of GOD to accomplish His purposes in His administration of the government of the universe of spirit and of matter.

The material and spiritual revelations of GOD were given man in a mystery, because that would excite his

curiosity to investigate them, and develop his intellect. If it had been possible for man to understand the spiritual laws before he had acquired some knowledge of the natural ones, the whole plan of Creation and Redemption would have had to be changed. There has been a continual evolution of both kinds of laws through man's research, and it is only recently that physical science has advanced so as to enable us to see it.

The SON of GOD was begotten of the FATHER before all worlds, and through the conception of JESUS, in the Blessed Virgin by the HOLY SPIRIT, He was born into this world the God-man, according to the laws of the material universe, and in Him the life of GOD, and the laws of the spiritual universe were indissolubly united.

He often spoke of His Church, or Kingdom, as not of this world, and compared it to natural objects. It is the abode of the HOLY SPIRIT, and of men who are spiritual children of GOD. He foretold that it would grow like a seed planted in the ground, and spread till it filled the earth, and the nations would lodge in its branches. It would be like leaven to leaven the world; and like a net cast into the sea gathering good and bad.

CHRIST controlled the laws of matter, and of life, and of death, and by His Parables He taught the analogies of natural and spiritual laws. By the parable of the Seed, He revealed the degrees in which man's spiritual life would develop, and which is now confirmed by all Christian experience.

All the known phenomena of the spiritual world are as much within the reign of law as the physical phenomena. The dependence of Christianity on its laws is as positive and demonstrable as Creation is on physical laws. Their kinds differ only as they pertain to different substances—one matter and material force—the other spirit and spiritual force, and more powerful than the former, because GOD is a Spirit. And in some things they act conjointly; and by that unity they manifest the wisdom of GOD in the purposes they accomplish. And they look to us even as if they were essential parts of common wholes.

In the parable of the Field, in which an enemy sowed

tares, CHRIST revealed the work of the Devil in sowing tares in His spiritual Field, and showed the analogies of evil in the natural and spiritual worlds. The Devil is a spirit yet he has done, and now does evil to GOD's material works; and the HOLY SPIRIT on the contrary resists Satan, thwarts his purposes, and turns them into blessings for men, and sanctifies men's bodies, souls and spirits.

And CHRIST often compared Himself to material things. He called Himself a vine, and His disciples the branches; and He said, "I am the Bread of GOD, which came down from Heaven;" and to the Samaritan woman he called Himself the living water, that whosoever drank of it should never thirst.

He prefigured the blessings of His salvation to water, because it is universal on the earth, and so a symbol of the fullness and freeness of His redemption. He said His disciples "having eyes see not;" it was the blindness of their spiritual vision, and showed the analogy of the laws of the natural and spiritual worlds.

They did not see, that the feeding of thousands with a few loaves and fishes was an exercise of supernatural power, on material things, and by a law of the spiritual world. He said also, "If thine eye be single thy whole body shall be full of light," which referred to a physical law which none but CHRIST then knew, and which is now known to be true in both natural and spiritual things. Indeed the whole drift of His parables, miracles, and doctrines appears to have been to show the intimate relations between the laws of the created and spiritual worlds, and that GOD, who is a Spirit, enacted them, and that both kinds of laws were under his control. And He told Nicodemus the nearness of these relations, saying, "Except a man be born again of water and the Spirit he cannot enter the kingdom of GOD."

And modern investigation of physical laws has helped to interpret the spiritual ones; and both will be more and more clearly seen as Science continues to advance in exploring the mysteries of the physical laws, because by their unity and relations it will be seen that they are best adapted to man's present and future life, and to glorify

GOD, because they make him more and more like GOD in understanding and in righteousness.

And to these ends the thought and study of the age are tending, and proving that one GOD is the author, and is now being the finisher, of His two conjoined works of Creation and Redemption; and that they could not have been accomplished without their mysterious correlations.

The laws of man's spirit are as real to him as the laws of his body. Fire will burn if it touches his flesh and sin will cause pain and remorse to his spirit. The animal life feels the pain through its senses; and the spirit feels it through its consciousness and conscience. Sensation and sequence follow alike to both soul and spirit.

Moreover the evolution of man's spiritual life from GOD, goes on in those who have the second birth of the Spirit to life's end, but does not end with death, for CHRIST said, "I am the resurrection and the life;" and S. Paul said, "it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that, when He shall appear we shall be like Him; for we shall see Him as He is."

That was said long after CHRIST's ascension to Heaven, and it means that we shall have spiritual bodies like that which He brought out from the tomb, and in which He ascended to Heaven, lacking only its Divine nature. The metamorphose of insects, the changes vertebrate animals pass through from embryo to birth, and the decay and renewal of the vegetable kingdom are types of the same law, that will cause man's resurrection in a spiritual body.

The difference between man's human life, and regenerate spiritual life is not a development, but a new birth which sanctifies the tripart man. The morality of a good unregenerate man is natural religion, and never can become Christian by any progress in a virtuous life; it will be only a self-righteousness, having material benefits. The regenerate life makes man a member of CHRIST, and able to acquire a Christ-like righteousness, without which there is no entrance into the Kingdom of Heaven.

The second birth of man, from his spiritual mother the Church, is by as positive a law as the law which gave him birth from his earthly mother, and in both GOD and water

were agents. Thus the two kingdoms, one of GOD and one of man, unite in the Christian, and that explains CHRIST's words, "The Kingdom of GOD is within you."

By doing our duties in that kingdom we grow into the likeness of CHRIST as long as we live and do our duty in it. We rise above the power not only of the material world, but also of the evil in the spiritual world caused by the temptations of the Devil.

But it is said that results do not confirm this belief; that the seeds of Baptism do not have such certain spiritual fruits as are seen in the seed sown in the earth. Nevertheless the results are identical. If an infant dies, and never reaches adult life, it does not destroy its Adamic nature. More than half the children born die before they grow up, but take a human nature to the life beyond. And of a thousand blossoms on fruit trees not one half bring to maturity the fruit they promise.

And because the Christian life does not visibly develop as man expects, it does not alter the fact that the life exists, and should it apparently die, it will not be extinct, but make its future existence worse, according to CHRIST's words, "He who knew his LORD's will and did it not shall be beaten with many stripes," or as He said of Judas, it were better for him that he had never been born.

Even the remission of sins by man's agency of baptism with water, is accompanied by the spiritual agency of God, who forgives not only the temporal penalty, but also the future eternal one, that else would be imposed on the future spiritual body. And there never has been a forgiveness of sins except by the shedding of blood of beast, or man, or CHRIST's. And here again the visible and invisible universe not only meet, but cooperate to accomplish God's purposes.

The unknown universal law of gravity, corresponds to the unknown spiritual law, which makes the communion of men with the Saints in Paradise, and with CHRIST their Head in Heaven. And the subjection of the body to the law of gravity is not more positive, than is the subjection of the spirit to the law of its gravitation towards GOD. And the correspondence is remarkable, inasmuch as

Science teaches that the physical law extends to the utmost known verge of the visible cosmos, and revelation teaches that the other reaches beyond it, and centres in GOD, who is a Spirit. And all intelligent beings in the universe are subject to it as well as man. For there can be no beings in existence who are not bound by this Law, "Thou shalt have no other gods but Me." And that law is so written in mankind, that there are none who do not believe in, fear, or worship some god.

And it is the work of theologians rather than physicists to prove the relations of these laws, because CHRIST committed it to them. And the superiority of spiritual laws is evident from the fact that GOD is an eternal, unchangeable Spirit, who enacted them, as He has revealed Himself, while Science teaches that there is a dissipation of energy going on in the physical universe, which may end in the destruction of all of its laws.

This analogy of the natural and spiritual laws, shows that Christianity is as much a branch of Science as Astronomy. The phenomena of the one are no more mysterious and unknowable than the other, and their resemblance is an evidence of their unity as a whole. The spiritual laws and Religion both existed in Heaven before Creation, for Religion is faith in GOD, and obedience to His laws. And the introduction of Religion into this world, and the promise of a Redeemer from Heaven show how inseparable the two works were in GOD's mind, and as they are now being seen by man, so far as he is able to understand them.

It is the power of the SON of GOD's Incarnate life, in His last gift of the HOLY SPIRIT, abiding on earth, and finishing the work He began in the flesh, that has made Christendom, and the Christian Church a vital force to enlighten mankind, to lighten the darkness of the Pagan world, and the last result is the feeling of a brotherhood among men, and, such benevolence and knowledge of GOD's universal laws as was never before known among them.

And we are continually discovering how these laws interpolate with one another. Seeds put in the ground

push up their blades against the law of gravity, even the vegetable life is a stronger force, though only intermediate between animal life, and man's immortal spiritual life, and so it is one kind of proof of its superiority to matter. And such examples teach us, that there is a limit to the knowable in both natural and spiritual laws, and show the fallacy of objecting to things unknowable by the senses or reason, because unknowable spiritual things are as apparent to man's spiritual senses, if the term may be used for his attributes, as the physical ones are to his animal senses.

There is also the same interpolation in the spiritual laws. When God pronounced Creation spiritually good, the Devil soon appeared and interposed sin and death, and began a continual conflict between good and evil, or sin and righteousness.

These forces clash in manifold ways; and it is by the resistance of man's spirit to the spirit of evil in the world, that his righteousness is developed, and his Christian character formed, and he is fitted for a higher spiritual life in a spiritual world.

JESUS told His disciples, that the Comforter, the HOLY GHOST whom He would send from the FATHER should abide, as the Spirit of Truth, and that they should "Know Him; for He dwelleth with you and shall be in you;" and we have as positive evidence of this by our spirit, as we have of truth presented to our senses.

And it will be by a concurrent study of physical Science, with its relation to spiritual laws, that we shall be able to comprehend their mysteries, so far as possible in their details and relations. And to investigate either one without the help of the other will end in failure. Because some scientists have tried the experiment, and confess they are confronted with the unknowable, as they call it. Unknowable only from their own lack of faith in GOD's written and spiritual revelations, because they did not use them to help them across a seeming chasm.

As there never was any other teacher like CHRIST, so also was there never any other teaching like His. Because he knew the causes and the reasons for all things,

in Heaven and on earth, and their relations to man's future eternal life, and He condescended by His Incarnation to enter into relations with all natural and spiritual laws, to work His work of redemption.

He said, "My Kingdom is not of this world," but its citizens are taken out of this material world to be fitted for it; and the growth of vegetable, animal and spiritual life helps us to understand our relations to His Kingdom, and how it is possible to be translated from the one to the other. The material creation was a revelation to angels as well as men. They were present, and rejoiced when it was finished, and they have been God's messengers, and assisted in the moral government of the world ever since.

They are the guardians of nations and churches and individuals, and they rejoice when sinners repent, and convey men's departing spirits to spiritual worlds. To them the material and spiritual worlds are but two parts of a common whole, as they are seen by God. And they are the two great witnesses, which testify to the way and the truth God has revealed Himself in His works, and words, and life to men, showing His power and wisdom, and His goodness, love and mercy.

We can think of God only as a Spirit, and the source of all spiritual laws. And we can think of Creation only as His work, and sustained by His power. It is not possible to imagine any force but the will and power of God that upholds the material universe. And there is more certainty of the continuity of the spiritual laws than there is of the material ones. Without it the physical universe would be subject to endless confusion and disaster. But with the higher laws God is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever; and the order which reigns in Creation is for the time a representation of the higher eternal law, and on that God's promises and man's salvation rest.

Science and Religion tend to perfection exactly as they discern their mutual relations, and so also do they glorify God. No religion in this critical and iconoclastic age of breaking down old superstitions, and laying the truth

bare to sight can satisfy its demands, that does not aim to show these relations; for none other can explain God's revelations in His word and Incarnate life; and none other would be adapted to him in this period of his greatest intellectual development. And that it now is so, is one of the best proofs of its Divine origin.

The only reason why Science and Religion have ever seemed in discord is, because their relations were unknown, or misunderstood. The laws of the material and spiritual worlds are as really correlated, as the laws and forces of nature are with one another. And they now assist in explaining their mutual relations. Yet the Agnostic scientists ignore the fact, and show more intolerance to theologians than the most bigoted have done to scientists.

It is as much the province of Religion to interpret nature as it is of Science, because God is not only the Author of both, but He has joined them in many ways. Even the external elements are as essential in the celebration of Christian rites and sacraments, as the inward and spiritual Grace. And it is not possible for man to rend what God has thus joined!

Religion is not only a positive branch of Science, but it is the most perfect one, because it existed in God's spiritual kingdom before the material worlds and man were created. The Bible sets them side by side, and as of equal authority. It represents the universe as under God's law; and it represents the Incarnation of the Son of God, as drawing all creation to Him; and that He will restore man from death, and the universe from dissolution in its present form, when it will become spiritual at the Regeneration. Matt. xix, 28.

Matter, Religion and man entered time simultaneously and were equally supernatural; and though the laws of matter and Religion differ essentially, and are not capable of the same kinds of demonstration, each one after its kind is as positive and demonstrable as the other. Attraction is as incapable of explanation as Regeneration; and the minds of all mankind tend to a belief in God, or some supernatural power who is the Author of all things.

And it is not true, that there is a sense of permanency in nature's laws existing nowhere else; because Christians rely as firmly on their experience, or the operation of spiritual laws, as scientists do on natural laws, and so more as they have the assurance of faith that they are unchangeable and eternal.

It is the loss of fact of the positive nature of spiritual laws that has caused the popular disregard of Religion by so many people. And nothing will help to recover men from their unbelief but the recognition of this fact; and there is but CHRIST's one way to do it, "He who will try the doctrines shall know that they are of GOD."

And the drift of the Christian world's thought is to-day towards that belief; and all the investigations of GOD's laws are showing more and more clearly the relations between the natural and spiritual ones, as they were known to GOD from the beginning. The accuracy of the scientific method has compelled theologians to accuracy in their studies, and thus they have mutually helped each other.

Men distinguished for their learning and knowledge of physical laws reject the Bible as a revelation from GOD, because they first doubt that it is from Him, and then refuse to study it as they study physical laws, and so remain in ignorance of its truths.

Every day of man's life of thoughts and feelings show that he is partly of a spiritual nature, and partly pertaining to the animal life. And none can any more discern between these operations than he can define the nature of his soul and spirit, or tell how they produce their results.

The pride of reason, and self-sufficiency make such men believe their own judgment infallible, they darken by their false science their faith and reason, and religious instinct, and give the homage they owe to GOD, to humanity.

They use their reason to judge, but will not exercise faith to discern the wonderful relations between GOD's Creation and written words, because He spake and Creation was made; so they narrow their horizon to the few material things they can understand, and reject the

grandest superior parts that make up His revelation as a whole, as it was revealed and is known to GOD.

There has been in this generation an extraordinary increase of the knowledge of the relations of the material and spiritual laws, and of the scientific character of Religion. And it is a fulfillment of GOD's prophetic promise, that in the last days knowledge should run to and fro, and men should become as gods, and the earth be full of the knowledge of the LORD.

The Psalmist said of the members of the Jewish Church, "Ye are gods; and all of you are the children of the Most High." And when the Jews wanted to stone CHRIST, for saying, "I and my FATHER are one," He reminded them of the Scripture which called men "gods, unto whom the word of GOD came," so it is reasonable to expect that the more men know of GOD, the more they will become like Him. And this is caused by the prolonged reign of the HOLY SPIRIT, and the light shed by CHRIST, as the Risen SUN of Righteousness, which has been increasing in the world ever since the HOLY SPIRIT came to abide, and enabling men to understand spiritual things. And we have learned that the laws of the spiritual world are its natural laws, as the laws of the material world are its natural laws.

We now see an intimate relation between GOD's four great kingdoms, and that they make together the one vast empire of GOD; and the Bible alone makes known the origin of Creation, and of GOD's design in its correlation with His spiritual kingdom. These kingdoms comprise the Mineral, the Vegetable, the Animal, and the Spiritual, which are essential to the unity of a common whole.

In the *Mineral Kingdom* there are chemical forces which caused crystallization, "which is the limit of its development," and the combination of gases and the elementary minerals, and organized the planets and solar systems under GOD's direction. And those forces had a supernatural origin, and were enacted by GOD, who is a Spirit; and they are universal so far as the material universe extends. But there is no life, nor consciousness in the forces, or elements of the inorganic world, yet they

helped to form the metals and minerals, the earth, air and water after their kinds; and they had a spiritual origin, and the whole universe is upheld by a supernatural power. Job says, GOD "stretcheth out the North over the empty place, and hangeth the earth upon nothing." If it be hung upon nothing, that is no material force, then it must be upheld by the power and will of GOD, both of which are spiritual. All physical laws are a revelation of GOD's mind and will made in, or on matter.

The *Vegetable Kingdom* could not be formed until the mineral kingdom was prepared for it; its members have a vital force by which they draw air, water and matter to promote their growth, and reproduction each one after its kind, and they work some mineral matter into their own substance. But it differs essentially from the other kingdom in that it has life and growth, and while they draw much from the mineral kingdom they can transfer nothing to it, nor can one plant be changed to another kind by any power of nature, or of man. And as the mineral kingdom was a preparation for this, so also was this a preparation for

The *Animal Kingdom*, which has elements from both of the former, has also a conscious animal soul-life and instinct which is automatic, and without a free will, laws written on them control them. And no species, or kind, as the Bible calls it, can change or be changed from one kind to another.

And while there is a wide gap between the mineral, and vegetable, and animal kingdoms, there is a yet wider chasm between the life of man and all other animals, of which he is the crown, because all others are dual—body and soul—he is triparte body, soul, and spirit, and by this last attribute he belongs to GOD's other,

The *Spiritual Kingdom* which includes Heaven where GOD and the Angels abide, and Hades which has one division called Paradise, where the Saints are, and another one called Tartarus where wicked angels and men are, and Hell where both will go after the Resurrection. The spiritual kingdom is the source out of which the others have come, and its laws are unchangeable and eternal.

And because man has an immortal spirit, and can be born again from above by water and the HOLY SPIRIT he can be made an inheritor of GOD's kingdom in Heaven. Thus it is, that in man the laws of these four kingdoms unite, and make him an epitome of the created and spiritual universe.

CHRIST called His Church the Kingdom of Heaven, and said it is not of this world, did not originate and will not end when its work is done here. He said He gave to his disciples eternal life; and that it is eternal life to know GOD. By knowing He meant being brought into spiritual relations with Him by membership in His Church. And He said of all such, "the Kingdom of GOD is within you." The material man is made partaker of a spiritual nature, and in him the elements of GOD's four great kingdoms are united.

This correlation of spiritual and physical laws constitutes Science as it is known to GOD, and Christianity is a peculiar branch of it, because by it GOD and matter have been eternally united in His Incarnate Son, as matter and spirit have been in all mankind, they are GOD's spiritual children.

And it was impossible for the human mind to understand this, until physical laws had been investigated as they have been in this century. The leaders in the world's progress have been often considered visionaries as were MOSES and CHRIST, and GALILEO and many others, but nothing has retarded the onward rush of knowledge.

We know nothing of GOD as a Spirit, except as He has revealed Himself in His works, and words, and the Incarnate life of His SON in CHRIST. And He said, "I and my FATHER are one."—"He who hath seen me hath seen the FATHER," and we must wait until we pass into the spiritual kingdom of GOD, before we can know more of the mystery.

We see by the operation of sin and righteousness on our bodies how nearly we are related to the spiritual worlds, and influenced by spiritual laws. Both are automatic laws acting independently of any interference on GOD's part, yet according to His laws. Sin and

righteousness exist in the spiritual worlds as well as on earth. The body and spirit avenge themselves when men sin, and because of sin man's body and soul die, and if the sin be unrepented there will be a second spiritual death, which will be unending pain and remorse.

In the record of the sin of Ananias and Sapphira is an example of the way sin affects men's connection with the spiritual world. When they pretended to give certain property for religious objects, and covetously withheld a part, saying they had given the whole, S. Peter said, "Satan had put it into their hearts to lie to the HOLY GHOST," and that they had "lied not unto men, but unto GOD."

In the two Sacraments, CHRIST instituted as the supreme acts of Religion, Baptism whereby regeneration is given, and the Eucharist whereby the spiritual life of CHRIST is refreshed and increased, the worlds of matter and spirit are brought into most intimate relations with the HOLY SPIRIT.

As the sun lightens the solar system, so CHRIST, as the SUN of Righteousness illumines the realms of His spiritual kingdom. The water, and bread, and wine are not changed by the contact, but they receive a new principle; expose water, bread, and wine to the sunlight, and they absorb caloric, an invisible material element, but they remain unchanged, and this analogy teaches us how it must be in the spiritual union of CHRIST with the earthly elements.

And that analogy shows, that CHRIST knew no difference between the operation of natural and spiritual laws. At man's first birth he receives an animal life and an immortal spirit, but in his second birth he receives the life and righteousness of CHRIST, and both of these births are after positive scientific laws as they were known to CHRIST, and were enacted by God.

And there is a remarkable analogy between the way man's natural and spiritual life are sustained and grow; the food that has no life in it sustains the animal life; and the bread and wine which have no spirit in them sustain

the spiritual life and increase it, because spiritual life is given to them by consecration.

Physical science knows of only two kinds of life, the vegetable and animal, but spiritual science is as positive as to spiritual life, though nothing would have been known of it, unless GOD had given the formulas in the Bible, to help us interpret it. And neither Theology nor Science can tell us why it is so. The unknowable is as positive on the physical side, as it is on the spiritual one. And we know as much of the spiritual laws by their operation on our spirit, as we do of the physical ones by their action on our bodies. We learn one by experiment, and the other by experience. There is a physical death to man's animal life which is certain, and there is a spiritual death possible, so called because it will be eternal suffering.

The Religion instituted by GOD, has been adapted to man in every stage of his development, as it is now adapting itself to the present enlightened one. And that is the reason why the harmony existing between all GOD's laws is becoming more apparent, as the invention of instruments which enable us to penetrate into the physical laws show more plainly their resemblances to the spiritual ones. There is a similar hiddenness in both, and we can understand the one as well as the other.

Christianity is the only religion man has ever had that was both sacramental and scientific. And that was first manifested by the Incarnation of the SON of GOD, and by His teaching, and the coming of the HOLY GHOST, to abide in the Church, and to transform the old carnal system of Judaism, into the spiritual and perfected Christian dispensation, its last stage of development, when the law, as it was interpreted by CHRIST, would be written on all hearts, and the way prepared for CHRIST's second advent, in the glory of the Godhead, and for the Regeneration, that will make all things spiritual.

And now the presence and power of the HOLY SPIRIT manifested through the ordinances and sacraments of the Church, and on man's spirit and will, are as veritable to Christian experience, as the outward and visible elements are to his animal senses.

The analogy between the impregnation and gestation of vegetable and animal life helps to the understanding of the higher spiritual life. The impregnation of the vegetable egg-seed is a wonderful mystery, as is also its gestation in its mother earth. It will neither sprout, nor grow without heat, light and moisture.

The communication of life to every egg-seed of the mammals, by the living mother, and the process of gestation by her, of each one after its kind, is a type of the more profound mystery, by which the mother Church gives spiritual life, by the new birth by the agency of water and the HOLY GHOST.

In all three the conception of life is a sudden act; two are material, and one is spiritual, yet the results are the same; while the after growth to the maturity of each one is after its kind, and by slow processes, and in which it is possible for the life to be retarded in its growth, or impaired, or even extinguished.

Scientists and theologians cause endless confusion by confounding man's soul and spirit. The soul is the animal life existing in all living creatures, but the spirit exists only in man, he alone has by it the consciousness of life, and death, and immortality, and a belief in God.

The creation of man, and the promise of another kind of man, in the seed of the Woman, were acts of revelation by God, that only an Almighty Person could have done or made known. And man only knows of these two kinds of life, and it is evidence to him, that the Author of them is omnipotent and omniscient, because he finds himself connected by them to the material and spiritual worlds.

The spontaneous growth of man's body by a physical law, and the growth of his spiritual body by its religious and intellectual development, for there can be no life or growth but in some kind of a body, teach us how intimate are the laws of the material and spiritual worlds.

The conditions of those growths are from laws impressed on them by God. The processes go on slowly year after year, and we see the increase in one, and we experience it in the other. And each one is scientific

after material or spiritual laws; only one is automatic, and the other by the exercise of the will and intellect, and in both cases it is by a vital force. And the spiritual growth is over the power of sin, and to an increase of righteousness, but it is as real in the one case as in the other, while the material growth will reach its limit, and cease to exist, the spiritual increase will go on forever.

The opinion that man thinks by his brain is a groundless supposition. He can no more think with his brain than with his heart. Nobody but a living soul or spirit can think. The brain and heart are centres where the life and spirit most manifest themselves; and no other creature on earth but man can consider, reason, and reflect on spiritual truth. The soul perishes with the body at death, but death does not touch the spirit, except to release it from the body and soul, whence it goes to spiritual worlds. JESUS said to the penitent on the cross, when only three hours remained to the end of the Jewish day, "To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise."

Finally no former age has made such discoveries of natural laws, and such instruments to investigate their secrets as our own. The use of the telescope, and microscope, and spectroscope, and steam, and electricity, and the telephone have increased our knowledge of natural laws, and have helped us to employ them for the benefit of mankind, and have given us new clews to interpret spiritual laws.

And chief among these wonders is the fact, that messages can be sent forward and backward on the same wires at the same time, which shows practically how thoughts may be conveyed inwardly from the visible world, and outwardly from man's spirit across the same nerves at the same time. And that is probably the highest proof that ever will be attained of the intimate relations, and the actual operations of life on matter, or the laws of the natural spiritual worlds, as a whole, as they are seen and known by GOD.

And the Psalmist clearly saw their relations, or he was inspired to record them when he wrote, "All the whole heavens are the LORD'S; the earth hath He given to the

children of men." The use of the plural in heavens looks as if it were designed to express both the material and spiritual heavens.

And the mind that will not believe in Religion, as a revelation from God, on such testimony as this, we may be sure would not believe it on the testimony of one who rose from the dead; because the rulers of the Jews would not believe in CHRIST's resurrection, though they knew He did rise, and they bribed the soldiers who testified to it to say, that "His disciples stole the body while we slept."

C. C. ADAMS.

THE BOOK ANNEXED AMENDED.

THE "certain alterations" supposed to be "demanded" in our Book of Common Prayer, "in the direction of liturgical enrichment and increased flexibility of use," as shown in the "Book Annexed," presented to the last General Convention, together with "the amendments" thereof made in that Convention,—are now before the Church, and must "be made known to the several Dioceses," and then again be acted upon at the next General Convention in 1886. The Book as amended, unfortunately for this article, has not yet been published, but we have now the "Book Annexed," and all "the amendments and alterations" in it, as "proposed" by the General Convention, and given to us in its supplementary Journal, already distributed.

These "proposed alterations" in our venerable Prayer Book must be of great interest to each of us, as members of "this Church," and will doubtless receive our critical and prayerful attention. It is true, we are not obliged to *act* upon them in our Diocesan Conventions, but we may and should instruct our Deputies to the next General Convention, to vote for accepting or rejecting them as a whole; or, on the other hand, for accepting the most of them, and rejecting one or more of the alterations, since it is expressly ordered "that they may be *severally* adopted in the next General Convention."

The writer of this paper is not particularly anxious for most of these proposed alterations, and would have preferred to keep the old Prayer Book as it is now, rather than have so many minute verbal changes introduced. It has been his great privilege, for many years, to say the

Public Service twice daily, and he never found the Office too long, or complained of the sameness of its opening Exhortation. At most, all that is really needed is an additional rubric, nearly such as was suggested by the Rev. Dr. Harison, which would give the necessary authority to shorten the regular order of services, under certain circumstances and restrictions. This rubric might be placed, in distinct type, at the foot of the page which is opposite to the Order for Daily Morning Prayer, and read as follows:

¶ *In the Order for Daily Morning Prayer, and in the Order for Daily Evening Prayer, upon Week-days, and at Morning Service on Sundays when the Holy Communion is immediately to follow, the Minister may omit so much as he may think expedient of that which precedes the LORD'S Prayer, and of that which follows the third Collect.*

One rubric such as this would render unnecessary the *many* rubrical changes now suggested, and accomplish nearly the same end. The new rubrics proposed should be carefully examined and compared together, and many inelegancies of language corrected, if they are to remain permanently in the Prayer Book. As an instance in point, in the first rubric before Morning Prayer, "*any day not a LORD'S Day*," might surely be changed for the better to "*any Week-day*." One rather marvels that so many rubrics should be emphasized as *new*, by the studious avoidance in them of the good old word *Sunday*, which has been so thoroughly Christianized in liturgical usage. Who would desire that "The Sundays after Trinity" should be called "The LORD'S Days after Trinity"? or that "All Sundays in the year" to be observed as feasts, should be changed to "All LORD'S Days in the year"?

It would not be interesting or desirable to go into any detail of all the alterations proposed. As it was well said by the Rev. Dr. Huntington in the Convention, these alterations are chiefly in the way of Abbreviation, Restoration, or Differentiation. Abbreviation dispenses, so far as may be, with duplicates, and renders enrichment possible, without too great bulk. Restoration returns to us the Evangelical Canticles of the *Magnificat* and the *Nunc Dimittis*, the longer versicles, and certain import-

ant words and phrases which had been unnecessarily omitted in our Book from the English model. The additional versicles may well be added to the Morning Prayer also. Differentiation aims to make the Order of Evening Prayer somewhat different from the Morning Prayer, and thereby to attract worshippers, who had already attended the Order for Morning Prayer.

In my judgment, by far the most important alteration proposed is in the rubric before the Apostles' Creed, and for this we are indebted to the House of Bishops, and to the Committee of Conference. In the Lower House the change had also been advocated; but was lost by the respectable vote of 93 to 128, a proportion of nearly 3 to 4. This proposed alteration in the rubric, no longer allows that "any Churches," (whatever that may mean) may omit an article of the Apostles' Creed; and such a change is necessary, if "this Church" is to be in accordance with its Baptismal Service, where it asks of the candidate to be baptized, "Dost thou believe *all* the Articles of the Christian Faith, as contained in Apostles' Creed?"; in accordance with its Office for the Visitation of the Sick, where the dying person is asked, "Dost thou believe that he went down into Hell?"; in accordance with Article III. of Articles of Religion, which affirms "As CHRIST died for us, and was buried, so also is it to be believed, that he went down into Hell"; in accordance with Article VIII., "The Nicene Creed, and that which is commonly called the Apostles' Creed, ought thoroughly to be received and believed"; and in accordance with the action of the General Convention, held in Wilmington, Delaware, October 11th, 1786, which passed a formal act, in which occurs this statement:

Now therefore, the said Deputies do hereby determine and declare :
First,—That in the Creed commonly called the Apostles' Creed, these words, "He descended into Hell," shall be and continue to be a part of that Creed.

This action of the General Convention of October, 1786, is the more significant and important, when we remember that it was taken in consequence of a letter re-

ceived from the Archbishops and fifteen Bishops of England, in which they wrote:

We therefore most earnestly exhort you, that previously to the time of your making such subscription, you restore to its integrity the Apostles' Creed, in which you have omitted an article, merely, as it seems, from misapprehension of the sense in which it is understood by our Church; nor can we help adding that we hope you will think it but a decent proof of the attachment which you profess to the services of your Liturgy, to give to the other two Creeds a place in your Book of Common Prayer, even though the use of them should be left discretionary.

One of these two Creeds here referred to by the English Bishops, the Nicene, was unanimously ordered in that Convention to be restored to the "Proposed Book," but the other, the Athanasian Creed, is unfortunately still a stranger to our Book, though our first great Bishop, Dr. Seabury, has left on record for our guidance his earnest wish for its restoration. He wrote to the Rev. Dr. Parker, December 29th, 1790:

I do hope, though possibly I hope in vain, that Christian charity and love of union will some time bring that Creed into this Book, were it only to stand as articles of faith stand, and to show that we do not renounce the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity, as held by the Western Church.

Pray GOD that this "some time" may speedily come, when "Christian charity and love of union" may bring back that Creed into our Book, "even though its use be left discretionary."

The new proposed rubric, instead of saying as now, "*And any Churches may omit the words, He descended into Hell,*" will read, "*And any Churches may, instead of the words, He descended into Hell, use the words, He went into the place of departed spirits, which are considered as words of the same meaning in the Creed.*" And thus, in GOD's good Providence, though after an interval of a century, we shall redeem our plighted faith to our Mother Church of England.

If one will examine the Journal of the General Convention of 1789, which gave us this original rubric, it will be

found that the word "Churches" is used there for Dioceses, as in the following examples:—"The Churches in the States of New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Connecticut," "the Eastern Churches," "a place of union among the Protestant Episcopal Churches," "the Churches represented in this Convention," "the sister Churches in these States," "the Convention of *any of the Churches*." This expression, then, "Any Churches," however some may have misunderstood it heretofore, and a few individuals have acted according to a different interpretation, does not mean "any Church," "any congregation," or "any minister," but only "any of the Churches," "any of the Dioceses," or "any Diocese." Fortunately, there are few or no persons at the present day who would desire, in the Creed, to omit, or even to change, this ancient Article, "He descended into Hell," for if the explanation above given of this phrase, "any Churches," be correct, neither an individual nor a congregation could rightly make the change, without the express vote of their Diocesan Convention permitting it.

The restoration of the *Magnificat* and *Nunc Dimittis*, and of the *entire Benedictus* and *Venite*, will be generally acceptable, and a real enrichment of our Book. The reservation of the second Absolution of the Morning and Evening Prayer to the service of the Holy Communion only, as in the English Book, is a decided gain, and the brief form provided in its stead, though not necessary, will be convenient in shortened services. In the appointment of a Collect, Epistle, and Gospel for the Transfiguration, we have had introduced into our Book, for the first time, a new Feast to our Blessed SAVIOUR. The "Book Annexed" and the House of Bishops had fixed the Feast for January 18th, but the House of Deputies, by a vote of 150 to 85, changed the day to August 6th, which is the day generally kept in the rest of the Church Catholic, and the Committee of Conference reported the same date for final adoption. The Rev. Dr. Egar would seem to have settled its *historical* status, by showing that it was kept on the 6th of August, several centuries before Pope Calixtus III., in 1457, made it a Feast of higher

order in the Roman Church, and appointed a special office for it. We learn from Beleth (1190), and Durandus (1286), that it was observed in their time, "on the day of S. Sixtus," which was the 6th of August. They both assign the same reason for its observance on that day, saying that it was "not because the Transfiguration was made on such a day, but because *then* it had *first* been manifested and published by those who had been with Him on the Mount. For the LORD had charged them that they should tell it to no man until He had risen from the dead. But they had kept silence even till that day." (Migne's *Patrol. Latin.* t. 202, col 147).

That the *rationale* of the Feast should require it to be observed in the Epiphany season, does not seem to be at all evident, nor is there any necessity that every Feast to our Blessed LORD should be kept between Advent and Trinity. The 18th of January, too, is liable to coincide with Septuagesima Sunday, which would be undesirable. In the "Book Annexed," the Gospel appointed for this day is from S. Luke. Yet in the parallel Gospel from S. Matthew, as given in the Sarum and Roman Missals, the account closes with those remarkable words, quoted by Beleth and Durandus, which seem to give the key-note to the meaning of the Transfiguration, as being to His sorrowing disciples and to us a type and earnest of our LORD's second coming in glory, and of the future glory of the *risen* bodies of His members, and therefore it is peculiarly appropriate that this Feast should be celebrated after Easter, rather than before it. "And as they came down from the mountain, JESUS charged them, saying, Tell the vision to no man until the SON of Man be risen again from the dead." Surely our SAVIOUR Himself hereby intimates to us that we should keep this day after His Resurrection, and in connection with it. Again, it seems rather strange that our Enrichment Committee should have gone out of its way to select a different Gospel from that given in our *old English* Missal, whence our earlier revisers always gathered the Gospels for our Prayer Book. S. Matthew's account is well suited for the Gospel of that day, for in it also occurs the word

"transfigure," which it seems desirable to emphasize, and which is not particularly mentioned by S. Luke. "And was *transfigured* before them." In the office as proposed, S. Matthew's account is not read until the second lesson in the Evening Prayer. It seems besides eminently suitable that there should be at least one Feast to our LORD after Easter, to brighten up the long Trinity season. And in a practical point of view, though many persons may be absent from their own parish churches, and be sojourning at the seaside or the mountains, in the month of August, yet even then and there it would be well for them to have a chief Festival, which may call them away from pleasure and excitement, to worship their glorified SAVIOUR. However, the majority of mankind will remain at their homes and business; and in country parishes a high Festival can be better attended in Summer than in Winter, with its falling weather and impassable roads. In every way, then, the 6th of August seems to be the best day for our new Feast. It is a curious historical fact that the Feast of the Transfiguration was commonly called, in olden times, "The Feast of S. Saviour," and in the Calendar of our old Sarum Missal, the 24th of May is marked as "S. Saviour's Day," which may perhaps have been an earlier usage than that of the 6th of August. Each of these dates comes after Easter, but the 24th of May would be an inconvenient time for this new feast, as it frequently coincides with the high Festival of Ascension-day or of Whitsun-day. It may be added, also, that Dr. Jarvis has placed the actual Transfiguration on Thursday, the 22d of May, one year before our SAVIOUR'S Crucifixion and Resurrection.

Enrichment is further provided for in a Burial Service for Infants, which was much needed, in proper Anthems for the highest festivals, in additional Canticles, in an office of the Beatitudes, in a short office for Sundry Occasions, in additional Prayers and Thanksgivings, in daily Collects for Holy Week, and in a second service for the Holy Communion on Christmas, Easter, and Whitsun-day. The short canticle *Benedictus es, Domine*, which is appointed as an alternative to the *Te Deum*,

used to be *sung* in the old Sarum Missal, as a Tract or hymn in the Eucharistic Service for Saturday in the Advent Ember-week, and was *read* for the fifth lesson in the same service for the Saturdays in the Lenten, Whitsun and September Ember-weeks. It is, perhaps, too nearly akin to the *Benedicite* to be a real enrichment. The new canticle *De profundis*, substituted by the House of Bishops for the proposed *Levavi oculos*, is probably too deeply penitential to follow as a response to the second lesson, from the New Testament. The *Benedictus* and *Jubilate* are quite sufficient, and more appropriate at any season, however mournful. One ought *always* to rejoice and be thankful for the reading of God's Holy Word. Now that the *Magnificat* and the *Nunc dimittis* have been returned to their old places, the mutilated Psalms *Bonum est* and *Benedic, anima mea* might have been dropped, as no longer needed, and as spoiling the symmetry of the office. Two canticles after the lessons would seem to be the greatest number that should be allowed. The office for the "Beatitudes of the Gospel" was unknown in Western liturgical usage, until suggested in the Book prepared by the Royal Commissioners in 1689, but it may be pleasing and helpful to some minds, though there is great danger that it will be used, contrary to the intention of its compilers, to the exclusion of the regular order for the daily services. The learned Bishop of Haiti, however, has recently reminded us that the Beatitudes were used in the service books of the Orthodox Christians of the East, more than a thousand years ago, and rather pleads for our using the "Woes" also liturgically, a use which I should decidedly deprecate. The new Prayers and Collects, being necessarily placed by the side of the old ones, which are matchless in language and rhythm, should be very carefully revised and made more harmonious, by the aid of our most devout masters of English prose, before they be finally admitted into our venerable Book. The additional Collect, Epistle, and Gospel for the three highest Feast days are a very decided gain, and an enrichment of the best kind. The Litany is to be said after the third Collect instead of after the

prayer for the President, which is a great improvement. The new deprecation in the Litany, "from fire and flood," *Good Lord, deliver us*, is the more needed by reason of our recent afflictions in this respect. Two additional suffrages have been added, one for the President, and one that it may please our LORD to send forth labourers into His harvest.

The second Confession for Evening Prayer might well have been a new composition, instead of a repetition of the Confession in the Evening Prayer for Families, which is associated by so many with that peculiar office.

The time-honored phraseology of the Interrogative Creed in the Visitation of the Sick had been changed by the Joint Committee in the "Book Annexed," but thanks to the Bishops and the Conference Committee, it has been restored.

In the interest of flexibility, yet in accordance with rubrical directions, the regular Order of Morning and of Evening Prayer may be shortened, at times; the longer Exhortation in the Holy Communion need only be read on one Sunday in each month; and the Decalogue may be omitted at the earlier Celebration, if a second Celebration is to follow on the same day. A layman is allowed to read the Lessons in Church, as in England, but without the desirable proviso of the English Book that the Minister should announce the beginning and ending of the Lesson. In the Communion of the Sick, the number required to commune with the sick man is reduced from "two" to "one at the least," and in the Public Administration of the Holy Communion, "two at the least" are now required to communicate with the Priest, or there shall be no Celebration. In the Communion Service, the Nicene Creed is printed in full; special permission is given that an Anthem may be sung at the Offertory; the *Tersanctus*, to be said or sung by the Priest and People, is put in a separate paragraph from its preceding Preface, which is ordered to be said by the Priest; in the Prayer of Consecration, a grammatical error is corrected by changing back the words "we and all others who" to their original form "whoso-

ever;" and the Collects at the end of the service are authorized to be said *before* the Benediction, or as occasion may require. The old Selections of Psalms from the Psalter are omitted, and a table of twenty new selections is inserted, with the numbers only of the Psalms given therein. The 141st Psalm of the Psalter is removed from the Morning to the Evening Prayer of the 29th day, which is a decided improvement, as those portions are thereby equalized, and the Psalm changed is peculiarly an evening one, for in it occur those solemn Vesper words, "Let the lifting up of my hands be an *evening* sacrifice."

The musical colon of the English Book is restored throughout in the Psalter, a few verbal changes are made in the text, and the correct Latin headings are given, wherever they had heretofore been misprinted. In the interest of ready reference, the Psalms are numbered in the Arabic notation. The writer thinks this desirable end could be better reached by putting the number of the Psalm or Psalms, near the day of the month, at the top of the page, in distinct black figures, with *Ps.* before them, and in brackets, as is done in the Manuscript Book in England, quoted from by Blunt in his recent, enlarged edition of the Annotated Prayer Book, and still retaining in the heading of the Psalms the Ecclesiastical and dignified Roman numerals of our Standard and of the Sealed Books. Another change made is in the unnecessary repetition, at the top of the page, after the late Irish Book, of Psalm or Psalms with the Roman notation added, and this is substituted for our peculiarly American improvement of a special title, "The Psalter." It is to be sincerely hoped that this old page-title of ours "The Psalter," which is both ancient and national, may be restored to us. The 119th Psalm is numbered in continuous verses from 1 to 176 in the present English Prayer Book, after their Manuscript Book, and it would be well for that Psalm to be so numbered also in our Book, for convenience in quoting it. The inspired divisions of eight verses each are sufficiently marked out by their separate Latin headings.

In the opening address of Holy Matrimony, in a reference to the Epistle to The Hebrews, the words "of S. Paul" are wisely changed to "in Holy Scripture." If the change be required here, much more should that phrase in the Visitation of the Sick be altered, which reads, "as S. Paul saith, in the twelfth chapter of Hebrews;" and also the title to the Epistle to The Hebrews, in our Bibles, will need to be corrected, at some time, although the learned authors of the Revised Version did not see fit to change it.

The new Lectionary was finally adopted, and is now our only standard for the Lessons. The 22d chapter of Numbers, containing the account of Balaam and his ass, which had been left out in the "Book Annexed" is restored to its old place, as the lesson for the Ninth Sunday after Trinity, by the action of the House of Bishops, and by that of the House of Deputies in a vote of 234 to 43, more than 5 to 1. In this connection, and to relieve the monotony of so much detail, a remark of the Rev. Dr. Adams, in the Convention may be quoted :

I notice that I have been put down in the papers to-day as a Low-Churchman. I am glad I was not called a Broad Churchman. Broad Churchmen are of two kinds. There is broad-shallow and broad-deep. Broad-shallow is exemplified by the Platte River out West, which is sometimes ten miles broad, and filled with sand banks. Broad-deep is illustrated by the Amazon, which is seventy miles broad where it goes into the sea, and 3,000 miles deep. Bishop Pearson belonged to the broad-deep Churchmen. Bishop Pearson said in regard to the matter of Balaam and his ass, that the words which Balaam's ass spoke were as much words of inspiration as the words which the false prophet spoke. That was broad-deep. Broad-shallow talked of Balaam and the ass in a kind of sneering way. Not being a Low Churchman, I would rather be considered a Broad Churchman of a peculiar kind.

Probably this last clause was a mistake of the reporter for "a Broad Churchman of the Pearson kind."

In the Confirmation Prayer, "Defend, O LORD," the "Amen" in Roman type, of the Standard Prayer Book, the "Book Annexed," and the English Book, is put by the Upper House in italics, thus making it simply a response of the people. Remembering this admitted rule,

that "whenever the word 'Amen' is printed in Roman characters, it should be said by the person or persons who have said the previous prayer, and when it is in Italic characters, *by the people only*,"—this change would seem to be a liturgical mistake, since that prayer is a special Episcopal act, and the "Amen" is manifestly a part of the Bishop's peculiar function, as it is also in the Conferring of the Ordination Commission, and as the Priest, in his ministerial character, alone repeats the "Amen" in the Baptismal formula. In the opposite direction, the *italicized* "Amen" of our Standard and of the English Book, in the Baptismal offices, after the prayer introduced by "Let us faithfully and devoutly give thanks unto Him and say," is ordered in the "Book Annexed" to be printed in Roman type, as requiring the people to unite in saying the prayer preceding it. "Let us give thanks and say" does not seem to mean more than "Let us pray," and need not require the people to join in the prayer, except at the "Amen." In the 1st Book of Edward VI., the rubric there shows it was intended only as an ordinary prayer. "*The priest shall add also this prayer.*" If, however, there be anything in this prayer which requires the "Amen" to be changed, it should be changed also in nearly identically the same prayer, at the close of the office for Baptism of Adults, though it is not there introduced with the words "Let us give thanks to Him and say." However, this last prayer should itself be entirely remodelled.

In Article I. of Articles of Religion, the "Book Annexed" had restored the word "all" before "actual sins of men," as in the present English Book, and the House of Bishops accepted the correction, but the House of Deputies declined to restore it, and the Committee of Conference sustained the action of the Lower House. Undoubtedly, the "all" rightly belongs to the text. It is true, that it is not in the Standard edition of our Articles, set forth by Bishop White, a copy of which is in the Whittingham Library, Baltimore, but this is owing to its unauthorized omission in most of the English Prayer Books of that time. The word "all" is found,

however, in the earliest form of the English Articles in 1552, is in all the *Latin* copies, without exception it is believed, of 1552 and 1562, and in the most authentic copies of the English Articles of 1562 and 1571. It is given in the Folio Victoria Prayer Book of 1844, where the Articles are copied from an edition by Christopher Barker, 1593, a copy of which was used by the Convocation of London in 1604, and was signed by the Bishops and whole Clergy of the Province of Canterbury, Richard Bancroft, afterwards Archbishop, presiding. This edition of 1593, therefore, seems to be the most reliable Standard of the Articles, which has been spared to us, the real Standard having been destroyed in the great fire in London, in 1666.

I have a genuine and unique copy, in black letter, of the fourth and last regular impression of Bishop Sparrow's "Collection of Articles, Injunctions," etc., (London, 1684, 4to). In this copy, at the end of "Articles of Religion, Anno 1562," there is written, probably about 1696, in a neat, antique, and scholarly hand the following statement:

One copy of the edition of Articles in 1593 by Christopher Barker, the Queen's printer, (which afterwards came into the hands of Eubule Thelwall of Nantelwyd in the county of Denbigh, Esq.) is thus subscribed in the proper hand of each subscriber. The preamble to ye subscriptions being in the hand of the Bishop of London or Presidents handwriting.

To all and singular the precedent Articles of Religion comprised in this book being in number thirty-nine; we the Bishops and whole Clergy of the the Province of Canterbury, assembled in the convocation holden at London upon a Public reading and deliberate consideration of the said Articles the 18 of May in the year of our LORD GOD 1604 willingly and with one accord consented and subscribed.

Ric. London, president,
Tho. Winton,
W. Lincoln,
etc., etc

DECANI

Ecclesiarû cathedraliû et collegiaturû,
Tho. Ravis Decan. ecclîæ xpo oxon, proloquutor,
Iacobus Mountagu Decanus Cappellæ Regiæ

et eccles. Lich.,
etc., etc

ARCHIDIACANI

Carolus Fothersbye, Archidiaconus Cantuariensis,
Michael Remigorus, Archidiaconus Wintoniensis,
etc., etc.

PROCURATORES CAPITULORUM

Phil. Bisse Proc. capit. Wellens
Rob. Herchers Proc. capit. Winton. K.
etc., etc.

PROCURATORES CLERI

Ric. Neile	}	Proc. Londô Diœces.
Zach. Parfield		
Guilm. Wode	}	Proc. Wigorn Dioces.
Tho. Forrest		

etc., etc.

And then in the same clear hand is added:

Memdû. These subscriptions were begun on the back of the last page in the Print. N. B. The edition of 1593 was corrected with a pen in the words *King* for *Queen*, *his* for *her*, etc., otherwise that edition agrees with this throughout (as far as this is printed in the black letter) excepting that where in this edition I have put this mark (caret) under any line, it signifies that, what is writ in the opposite margin, ought to be inserted according to the edition of 1593; and where in this edition — is drawn under a word (words), syllable, or letter; that shows what was so markt was omitted in the fores'd edition; or differed as specified in the margin.

In Article II., "all" is written on the opposite margin, with a caret mark between "for" and "actual," as requiring the word "all" to be inserted in the text of Bishop Sparrow's reprint, it being found in the authoritative edition of 1593.* To this remarkable historical proof, need only be added Hardwick's weighty testimony "that the omission of this important word in many modern copies of the Articles is without the least authority." The "all,"

* In a book in the Whittingham Library, entitled *Illustrations of the Doctrine, Principle and Practice of the Church of England*, London, Pickering, 1840, p. 134, we find the following confirmation of the above statement. "The Convocation of 1604 subscribed an English edition, [of the Articles] printed at London, by the deputies of Christopher Barker, 1593 qu. The original, with their autographs, is now at Lambeth; See Todd, xxxi. 201-209.

too, is certainly Scriptural, and in accordance with the other Articles. 1. John i. 7. reads "The Blood of JESUS CHRIST HIS SON cleanseth us from *all* sin." Article XXXI. affirms "The offering of CHRIST once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for *all* the sins of the whole world, both original and actual." Surely this is only a repetition of the phrase "for *all actual* sins of men," and therefore, in every point of view, the "all" should be restored in Article II.

In the prayer of Consecration, the Invocation is printed in a separate paragraph, which is a decided improvement. It is to be hoped that the introductory sentences in it, and the sentences of the Consecration of the Bread and of the Wine, and indeed every sentence in this great prayer, and in that of CHRIST'S Church Militant, may likewise be printed in paragraphs, as they are in the modern Scotch Book. Such an arrangement would much assist both Priest and People in thoughtfully offering these long and important prayers. The Committee of Conference did good service in adjusting the varying action of the two Houses, but in one or two instances, it seems to have exceeded its powers, in taking action where there was no disagreement. Both Houses had adopted the rubric before the LORD'S Prayer in the Morning Service, as changed in the "Book Annexed," but the Committee of Conference, notwithstanding, restored the rubric to its form in the present Standard. In the rubric after the Collect for the First Sunday in Advent, the two Houses agreed to change the word *before*, as given in the "Book Annexed," to the word *after*, and here, again, the Committee restored the word *with*, as it now reads. The two Houses also voted to insert the phrase, "*the Sunday next before*," after the word "*before*," in the first line of the rubric preceding S. Andrew's Day, but this action the Committee has overlooked or disregarded, as that amendment does not appear in its Report. Our present Prayer Book, ending with the Institution Office, closes with the somewhat loose expression, "Minister as he may choose," but the "Book Annexed" has the Articles

last, and thus happily concludes with the expressive and important words, "*justice, judgment, and truth.*"

The restoration of what has been called "The Lost Liturgical Enrichment," as ably advocated by the Rev. Dr. Franklin, in a late number of this REVIEW, by the return of the Invitation, Confession, Absolution, Comfortable Words, and Prayer of Humble Access to their old and proper place *after* the Consecration Prayer, should certainly be entertained, and, if possible, be accomplished. In addition to the arguments already advanced for this much needed return to a correct order, we should besides be restoring the same arrangement that is in the present Scotch Book, from which our own Eucharistic Office is chiefly derived, and the beautiful connection between the Tersanctus with its "Heaven and earth are full of thy glory; Glory be to thee, O LORD Most High," and the majestic opening of our Prayer of Consecration, with its "All glory be to thee, Almighty GOD, our heavenly FATHER," would be more clearly seen, and be better appreciated by all our people.

Another wise enrichment would be to restore the LORD'S Prayer to its most ancient place immediately after the consecration.

Proper *Introits* of a verse or a Psalm, and a *Post Communion* Collect to be used just before the Blessing, for each Sunday and Holy Day in the year, would be eminently desirable to be added to our Enriched Book. In a manual for "Holy Communion," published by Lumley, London, many years ago, (the writer's copy was purchased as far back as 1859), there are admirable *Introits* and *Collects* for all the Holy Days, *in majestic and rhythmical English*, which were translated chiefly from the Gallican offices, remarkable for their constant use of Scripture language, and formerly used in the Diocese of Paris, before Rome cruelly crushed out the Diocesan Rites, and made everything conform to her one iron-clad Roman Order. The familiar language of our Catechism may be recognized in this *Post Communion Collect* for the Fourth Sunday in Lent, "Refreshment Sunday," addressed to our SAVIOUR. "We beseech thee,

O LORD, of thy pity, so to guide our infirmity which Thou dost vouchsafe to nourish with this heavenly Food, that 'our souls may be strengthened and refreshed by Thy Body and Blood as our bodies are by the bread and wine,' who with the FATHER and the HOLY GHOST livest and reignest, one GOD, world without end. Amen." The Introit could be printed before the Collect for the Day, and the Post Communion Collect after the Gospel.

Another feature that would improve the symmetry and usefulness of our daily offices, would be the return of the "Lesser Litany" and the LORD'S Prayer to their old place after the Creed, as it is in the English Book. On this point, the learned Liturgist, Freeman, wisely says (and Blunt agrees with him), "that 'The Short Litany' or threefold petition, 'LORD, have mercy,' etc., ushering in the LORD'S Prayer, Petitions and Collects, is to the *prayer* what 'Glory be' is to the *praise*, of the whole office; a prayer setting the tone and fixing the object of all the rest by being addressed to the Holy Trinity. * * * It will already have been discerned," he further remarks, "that the LORD'S Prayer, at this its second occurrence in the service, wears a widely different aspect, and discharges quite other functions from what it did as prefacing the whole Office. A preface, indeed, it still is, to all the coming acts of prayer, and the model and summary of them. But, 1, it has a peculiarly baptismal aspect in this place, from its connection with the Creed; and, 2, it is now used far less in reference to the remainder of the office than to the needs of the coming day or night." Canon Medd, at the late Church Congress in England, in "Remarks on the Services of the Church, and their Adaptation to Modern Needs," says:

The objection to their length is now removed by the Shortened Service Act. * * * More shortening than this is mutilation; and especially the intolerable omission of the second LORD'S prayer, which is the keystone of the arch, the very gem, centre, and kernel of the whole office, around which, as the primary nucleus of crystallization, all else has grown, to which all that precedes leads up, of which all that follows is the expansion.

It is a well-known historical fact, that the folio Prayer Book of 1636, in which the corrections were made for the present Standard in England, and that the first Scotch Book of 1637, had each of them a space before the first LORD'S Prayer in the Morning Service, with an elaborate floriated ornament separating it from the preceding introduction. In the Sealed Book, and in the Manuscript Book, in like manner, at the end of the rubric after the Absolution, both at Morning and Evening Prayer, there are two thick lines drawn, with a considerable space above and below them, before the LORD'S Prayer. In Bishop Cosin's Durham Book, he wrote after the "Amen" in the Absolution, "Place here a fleuron," and at the head of the LORD'S Prayer, he has made a note, "Set here a faire compartment before this title." And although he has not erased the previous title before the sentences, he has here repeated it, "An Order for Morning Prayer." He and the other Revisers probably contemplated the occasional use of a short service from which all before the LORD'S Prayer was to be omitted. Now that we are to have, at times, such a shortened service, it would be eminently desirable to mark the new beginning of it by a space and the two black lines, and perhaps the close of it, too, by the same, at the end of the third Collect.

It is to be hoped that the capital "T" in the sacred words, "This is My Body," "This is My Blood," and the capital "D" in "Do this," may be restored to us, as in our first Standards of 1790 and 1793. These capital letters connect our Book with the Scotch original of our Eucharistic Office, where the entire phrase was printed in capitals, and the small "t" and "d" are entirely without authority, having crept in from a misprint in editions that were afterwards made Standards, the "t" from an edition in 1818, and the "d" from one in 1831.

In the LORD'S Prayer, "The Power" is better English and more correct than our American form, being in accordance with the present English Prayer Book, the Sealed Books, and the Manuscript Book. The "and"

was inherited by us from a misprint in the English Books of that time.

It may be mentioned here, that in the Manuscript Book, which is the highest authority in England, as it is stated by Blunt in his late revised Annotated Prayer Book, (almost a *new* work, as enlarged), in the phrase in the Baptismal Office, "Sanctify this water," the words "THIS WATER" are written in capital letters throughout, in all the offices, and it seems very strange that this should have been overlooked in all the printed Books in England.

The correction "living *or* dying" for "living *and* dying," in the Family Prayers, may well be questioned, for Bishop Gibson, the author of the phrase, had before used in his longer Form the expression "whether we live *or* die," in close connection with that of "living *and* dying," but here it would seem there is no such alternative intended, but he would have us pray that *both* in life *and* in death, we may be GOD's.

As a true branch of CHRIST's holy Catholic Church, "this Church," possesses a threefold ministry of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, and while she is necessarily "Episcopal," as having Bishops, and "Presbyterian," as having Priests, and "Diaconal," as having Deacons, there seems no need for her to call herself, from one order alone, exclusively "Episcopal." The term "Protestant," in like manner, is a negative one, protesting against errors of every kind, which a Catholic Church must necessarily do, without always expressing it, and the term has become so loose in meaning, that in Europe it is now almost synonymous with "heretical." It was first used in a *political* sense, as protesting against the Emperor, Charles V.'s brief, at the Diet of Spires in 1529. Moreover, our Mother Church of England has never adopted it in any of her Offices or Documents, though she was again and again urged to do so. Doubtless, then, as attention is more and more directed to the misleading character of our distinguishing name, and public opinion is further instructed, we shall in the near future remove the words, "Protestant Episcopal" from the title-page of our

Prayer Book, and substitute "Anglo-Catholic" in their stead, as showing that we are the Reformed English Branch of the Church Catholic in the United States of America. "Anglo-Catholic," it will be observed, is not the same as Anglican, nor is it equivalent to the Church of England, but it may well represent the Reformed Catholic Church in this country. If a more national title be desired, "American" or "American Catholic" might be used, but these are open to the objection of arrogancy in claiming to be the whole Catholic Church in the United States.

But whatever changes may hereafter be made in our Book, it is to be earnestly hoped that "The Book Annexed Amended" will not be allowed to pass, *just as it is now proposed*, but that it will receive, during these three years, the fullest criticism from our foremost scholars and theologians, and be further enriched by them, and then, after all corrections and improvements have been duly made in 1886, be finally adopted, if deemed necessary, in 1889, exactly one hundred years after its first revision and ratification.

FREDERICK GIBSON.

THE SCHOLASTIC THEOLOGY; ITS CHARACTERISTICS, ITS MERITS, ITS DEFECTS AND ITS PERMANENT RESULTS.

THE Scholastic Theology fills a large space in the history of the Church, and has had a mighty influence in molding that history even to our own day. The phases of mind, which it has developed, form a most interesting study, and the teachings of its irrefragable, its angelic, its seraphic, and its subtle Doctors have prolonged their effects into the doctrinal teaching of the Christendom of our own times. Anselm, for example, yet lives in doctrines which are generally or largely accepted, in acute discussions of the deepest problems of theology, which are lineal descendants of his; Thomas Aquinas is not yet gathering dust, and consigned to the investigations of the book-worm on the shelves of theological libraries, and his *Summa* is yet an accepted text book of Roman Catholic Theology, as well as a book deemed worthy of study, by Anti-Roman theologians. Duns Scotus is yet prized and his teachings accepted by a very considerable portion of the theological world, and Abaelard has imitators if not followers in the writers and thinkers of what they term a rational and revolutionary theology.

The theology of the Greek Church may be said to have been crystallized in its fixed and immovable form by John Damascenus. Of that Theology his work *De Orthodoxa Fide* is the true and accurate repository and representative. Since his day, the Greek Theology has received scarcely any modification or addition of new independent speculation upon the articles and mysteries of the Faith. His exposition was entirely in the line of the traditional theology of the Greeks from the days of Chrysostom, Basil, and the Gregories, to the Second Ni-

cene Council, and by its unvarying continuance it has acquired rigidity and fixity.

But a new spirit was awakened in the Western Church from the eleventh century onwards, which created and gave character to what has been known as the theology of the Schoolmen. This Theology has several stages of its existence from its rise in the eleventh century till its final extinction, till its death from its own inherent tendencies and characteristics, in the fifteenth. The establishment of schools in the Carolingian Empire in the first half of the eleventh century at Rheims, Chartres, and Tours were the first attempts of systematic theological teaching. The Cathedral Schools, which had occupied themselves with the *Trivium* and *Quadrivium*, that is, with the subjects of a secular liberal education, contributed nothing to the development of Scholastic Theology. But the schools above mentioned educated those who introduced the application of the logic of Aristotle to Theology. Since the beginning of the twelfth century the teachers of this logic and Theology formed connections with each other; these associations united themselves with the schools of the free Arts; and thus arose the University of Paris under the Name of the *Studium Generale vel Universale*, the constitution of which was completed about the year 1250. Other institutions of like character were founded, as those at Bologna and Oxford. This last, next to Paris, obtained the greatest significance (since 1200) for the Scholastic Theology.

The Schoolmen of the twelfth century had only the *Organon* (his dialectics) of Aristotle in the Latin translation of Boethius. Their treatment of Theology therefore with the aid of the *Organon* was purely logical. But all the works of Aristotle had been translated into Arabic, and the study of his philosophy flourished in the Moorish schools of Spain, as well as in the rest of the Arabian world. Scholars from Christian Europe went to study in the schools of Spain, and soon the work of translating into Latin the writings of the Arabian Aristotelians began. In these books the doctrines of Aristotle were

mingled with and modified by those of his Arabian translators and commentators.

The effects of this influence soon became manifest in erroneous constructions of doctrine that was professedly Christian. And the use of the logic taught by Aristotle had led to a treatment of theological subjects, in which the object seems to have been logical triumph, rather than the exposition of Christian truth. A story is told of Simon of Tournay, teacher of Theology at Paris about 1200, which illustrates one tendency of this method of teaching Theology by the rigid application of formal logic to its elucidation. The story shows how logic might be converted into a two edged sword, by which either side of an important discussion might be attacked or defended.

In a certain lecture, Simon having started a variety of doubts on the doctrine of the Trinity, he deferred the resolution of them to the next day. The whole tribe of theological students flocked with eager expectation the next day, to his lecture room, when he explained all the difficulties in so satisfactory a manner that the whole assembly were struck with one sentiment of admiration. Several of them, who were intimate with him, now went up and earnestly besought him, that he would dictate the lecture over again for them to copy, that all this knowledge might not be lost. Scouting such a consequence, with a burst of laughter he exclaimed: 'O my little JESUS, little JESUS, how much have I helped to establish and glorify Thy doctrine! Verily, had I a mind to stand forth as its opponent, I might bring still stronger arguments against it.' But no sooner was this uttered than he found himself unable to speak another word; he had lost both voice and memory. He had to spend two years in learning over again the alphabet; and only with the greatest difficulty succeeded in recommitting to memory so as feebly to stammer out the LORD'S Prayer and the Creed. *Neander's Ch. Hist., Vol. IV., p. 418.*

Early in the Scholastic movement, in the first period of its progress, two of its teachers were led astray into doctrines, which were wholly subversive of Christianity, though they were invented and uttered in the name of Christian Theology. These two were David of Dinant and Amalric of Bena. In somewhat different forms and expressions, they put forth and taught views of the Universe and of GOD, which were clear and undisguised Pan-

theism. According to Thomas Aquinas, Amalric and his followers started from the principle that GOD was the formal principle of all things. Amalric or his followers moreover taught that GOD the FATHER was Incarnate in Abraham, GOD the SON in Mary, and GOD the HOLY GHOST in each and every believer; that all things were one, because, whatever is, is GOD. So the Body of CHRIST was in the Bread before consecration, and the utterance of the consecrating words only rendered this which before existed, apparent in the accidents or visible elements. The followers of Amalric, under the name of Brethren of the Free Spirit, adopted the most licentious inferences from Christian doctrines, and from their theory of spiritual indwelling and influence. David of Dinant asserted that GOD and the first material, and the Nous or mind were the same, and endeavored to prove this position from the topics of Aristotle. He avowedly drew his Pantheism from the metaphysics and physics of Aristotle, and uses his technical phraseology. Thus was exhibited one of the extreme tendencies and results of the application of the Scholastic method and philosophy to Theology, in the first period of its existence, which was matched by like destructive results in the closing period of its career. These earlier results led to the condemnation of the works of Aristotle on metaphysics and natural philosophy in the Synod of Paris in 1209, and by a Papal Legate in 1215. The works so condemned however were not the genuine works of Aristotle, but the reconstructions of him by Avicenna and Algazel.

Soon after this time however the genuine works of Aristotle were translated into Latin partly from Arabic versions, and especially from the Greek, since the Greek originals had become accessible by the conquest of Constantinople by the Latins. So that the prohibitions from Rome became obsolete, and after the year 1230 the supremacy of the Aristotelian philosophy in Western Christianity was decisive. His philosophy was professed by the Church teachers, both Dominicans and Franciscans in the University of Paris, and so the second period of Scholastic Theology was introduced.

In the first Scholastic period the philosophy of Plato, as interpreted by the Neo-Platonists, had been the prevalent one with teachers of Theology. With these views were combined those derived from the works of the so-called Dionysius the Areopagite. His works had been translated into Latin by John Scotus Erigena in the ninth century, and by him largely applied in his unique construction of a Christian Pantheism! "GOD save the mark."

There were certain philosophical questions which ran through the Scholastic Theology in all stages of its existence, and according to the different views, which were taken of these questions, the theology of individuals and schools, became divergent, as it was modified and molded by the philosophical views which, on the one or the other side, were adopted.

Perhaps the most celebrated philosophical question, which was debated, and variously determined was that with regard to the existence of Universals and their relation to the particular and the individual. The question was whether general things or universals, such as genus, species, difference, the singular, and the accidental existed outside of the human understanding. Plato had named these universals, ideas and had ascribed to them reality in the Divine Intellect, in which they were patterns after which individual things were formed. Such universals were called by the Scholastics, Universals before the thing *universalia ante rem*. Aristotle also taught the reality of Universals, but maintained that they were in the things themselves, so that in the individual things the Universals found their own presentment and form. Individuals were the result of the different combinations of Universals in the individual things, which were different. The Universals of Aristotle were therefore known as *universalia in re*. The Stoics denied wholly the existence of these universals, and maintained that nothing had reality but single existences, and that Universals were only abstractions of our understanding from individual things, conceptions of our own understanding simply, therefore mere names, by which these conceptions were designated. These were *Universalia post rem*. Those

who held the reality of Universals in the sense of Plato or of Aristotle were the Realists; those who explained Universals as abstractions or names were designated as Nominalists.

Another philosophical question in all the ages of Scholastic Theology was that which related to the use of philosophy in its application to theological exposition and discussion, and to the solution of this question answers were at different times given. There were those who made philosophy subservient to the supremacy of faith and Divine revelation, who used it to expound and confirm to human thought the truths of revealed religion; there were those who placed reason before faith, and required faith to submit itself to the scrutiny of reason; and finally there were those who maintained the extreme position, that what was theologically true might be philosophically false.

But in the second and third periods of the reign of this theology, in the period of its bloom, and in that of its decline and decay, Aristotle was always referred to under the honorable name of the Philosopher, and his Sentences were treated as judicial determinations. Says Cornelius Agrippa of Nettersheim, *De vanitate scientiarum*, Cap. 54 "This same Aristotle indeed was as necessary before the Incarnation of the Word of God, as the conferring of grace necessarily presupposes the condition of Nature itself: because Aristotle was the greatest teacher and inventor of the law of nature. From which it is evident that Aristotle was the forerunner of CHRIST in things natural, as John the Baptist was the forerunner of CHRIST to prepare a people for Him perfect in the things of grace." And he adds that the objection is worthless, that Aristotle was before the law of grace, because Augustine says there were some men of the old law, who by the perfection of grace belonged to the law which was new.

Anselm may be regarded as the first Schoolman of the first period of Scholastic Theology, though his method of discussion was more free and natural, without the technical phraseology, and the formal unvarying arrangement of arguments of later schoolmen. He was a man of many sided activity, in his various offices of Prior, Abbot

and Arch-bishop, as well as defender of the Church against the aggressions of the civil power, and of the doctrine of the West against what was held in the West to be the erroneous interpretation of the Creed by the Greek Church in the Article of the HOLY GHOST. In the duties of his office in the monastery and in his Diocese he was assiduous, not shrinking from the most irksome offices of Christian love, eminently devout, and in the clearness and profundity of his speculative intellect unsurpassed. His heart and life were full of the most unmistakable feelings and exhibitions of practical, tender, beneficent Christian love. And in his writings he has embodied discussions and expositions of Christian truth, which will live and be valued through all ages of the Christian Church. He was like his teacher Lanfranc a Realist in Philosophy and had occasion to use his philosophical theory in the defense of the doctrine of the Trinity against the erroneous statement of Roscellinus, who was a Nominalist, and who, by Anselm, at the Council of Soissons, 1092, was encountered and compelled to recant. Roscellinus had said that the persons of the Trinity must be three things, (individuals) and consequently could not be, one thing or essence, for this last assertion would have been inconsistent with the nominalistic opinions of Roscellinus.

The next noted Schoolman of this period was the world-famous Abaelard. His view of the connexion of philosophy with Religion was the diametrical opposite of that of Anselm. Anselm had given to faith the precedence over the reasoning and knowledge of intellect. He says expressly, "A Christian ought to advance through faith to understanding, not through understanding to come to faith, or if he is not able to understand, should not recede from faith. When he is able to attain to understanding he is delighted: but when he cannot, he venerates what he cannot comprehend." For he says, "Neither do I seek to understand that I may believe; but I believe that I may understand." The position of Abaelard was the opposite of this. He maintained that what was proposed to belief must first be tried whether it ought

to be believed. The intellect and its exercise must go before faith. There must be an insight into the truth, before it can be accepted. For he asks, "How then are they to be heard who deny that the faith is either to be built up or defended by reasons? For if when any thing is persuasively offered for belief, nothing is to be discussed in it by reason to determine whether it should or should not be believed; what remains but that we should agree with those equally who preach things false, as well as with those who declare things which are true." Again he says, "Whoever thinks that those things which are spoken concerning the Trinity in this life cannot be understood falls into the error of the heretic Montanus which the blessed Jerome condemns in his prologue to the Commentaries on Isaiah." Concerning such mysteries as the Trinity indeed Abaelard did confess that "he could not promise to teach a truth, to which we believe neither we nor any mortal to be competent: but we may at least propose something which is like the truth and akin to human reason, against those who boast that they impugn the faith by human reasons, nor do they care for aught except human reasons which they know, and they easily find many who agree with them." Abaelard then accepted all the Faith of Christianity as it was then held in the Church, but he used his reason to the fullest extent in the exposition and establishment of the truth, which he thus expounded. And in this free rationalistic handling of revealed truth he exposed himself to much and harassing opposition from those who held fast the traditional Faith of the Church. His doctrine of the Trinity was impugned by S. Bernard. He was accused by S. Bernard as the subverter of the Faith, as one who eviscerated the secrets of God, ventilated rashly questions on the deepest themes, insulted the Fathers, because they thought that such questionings were to be rather put to sleep, than set free. Abaelard was condemned at the Synod of Sens 1140, sentenced to confinement in a monastery, but was secured a place of refuge by Peter the Venerable, Abbot of Cluny, where soon after he was released from his troubled and stormy life by a welcome death. The book

of Abaelard entitled *Sic et Non* is a good illustration of his spirit of free inquiry, of his encouragement of doubt as a preliminary to the ascertainment of truth, of his willingness to submit all revealed doctrines, which even he himself professed to believe, to the largest handling of free thought. In this book on different subjects of faith and morals, he arrayed against each other the sayings of ancient Church Teachers, not to reconcile them, not to show their agreement in doctrine, but to let them stand in the fullness of all their apparent antagonism. And thus was that sceptical tendency encouraged, if not engendered, which was the shady side of the Scholastic Theology through all its history, and which at last proved to be its self extinction.

Bernard's view of the relation of reason to faith was quite different from that of Abaelard. There were three methods, according to Bernard, by which men might strive to comprehend the Divine, viz., by insight, by faith, and by opinion. Faith was in the middle ground between insight and opinion; more certain than opinion, less perfect than insight. Faith alone could appropriate the truths of salvation to pious feeling; mystical contemplation, devout consideration was the way to deeper enjoyment and possession. Such handling of revealed truth by the understanding, as in the case of Abaelard, was, in the view of Bernard, a desecration of the Sanctuary. Bernard took similar offence to the false position as he regarded it, of Gilbert de la Porret (Bishop of Poitiers). Gilbert was a Realist, and applied his theory in the interpretation of the doctrine of the Trinity. He maintained that the Godhead was the generic conception of the individual conception-GOD. In this Universal of the Godhead the Persons were one, but it could not properly be said that FATHER, SON and HOLY GHOST were one GOD, or that the Godhead became flesh. At the Council of Rheims, 1148, Bernard presented counter propositions to those of Gilbert, and sought his condemnation, but jealousy of Bernard's influence over the Pope saved Gilbert from censure, so that he returned uncondemned to his Diocese.

These occurrences led to greater circumspection among the Scholastics in the utterance of their opinions and statement of their doctrines. They began to teach by Sentences from the Church Fathers, especially from Augustine, and appended to these their own analysis and interpretation. One of the first of these *sententiarii* was Robert Pulleyn, teacher of theology in Paris and at Oxford, and at last Cardinal. He died about 1150. But the most celebrated of these *sententiarii*, who, in fact, for centuries, occupied the position of Master of Sentences, was Peter Lombard. He was teacher of Theology in Paris, and afterward Bishop of Paris. He died 1164. In his work of Sentences Lib. IV., he sets forth all the doctrines of theology held in the Church, and confirms them by dialectic treatment, together with Sentences from the Church Fathers, whose discrepancies if any appear, he strives, by logical reasoning and explanation, to reconcile; a method very different from that pursued by Abaelard in his *Sic et Non*. He thus satisfied the Scholastics, and also by his orthodoxy and submission to Church testimony and authority, those who had no capacity or taste for the fine distinctions of the Schoolmen.

On his book lectures were read for centuries, in the Universities; upon it many commentaries were written; it was the accepted text book of mediaeval theology. In some few points, not necessary here to mention, among them points relating to the Trinity and the Incarnation, as the matter was put by the Divines of Paris about 1300, "the Master of Sentences is not commonly held by all." These Divines specified more than sixteen articles from which they thus expressed their dissent. And in fact his distinction alike on the subject of the Trinity and of the Incarnation was well nigh too subtle for profitable comprehension. His Nihilism, as it was called, with respect to the Incarnation really annulled that Divine fact, by the declaration that the Divine SON did not become anything (aliquid) by becoming Incarnate.

After William of Champeux, the first teacher of Abaelard had been cast into the shade by his more eloquent and able pupil, he retired to the neighborhood of Paris,

and founded there a School of Theology, in connection with the monastery of S. Victor, which produced a succession of Church Teachers, the Victorines, who introduced a new element into the teachings of Scholastic Theology. They gave it a mystical and practical bent blended with its former character of rather sole intellectual speculation. The most eminent of these Victorines was Hugo a S. Victore, who was called after Augustine *lingua Augustine*. His most important work is *De Sacramentis Christianae fidei*. Lib. II. containing an entire body of Christian Doctrine, speculatively and mystically treated. This was the first attempt to determine scholastically the degrees of mystical intuition.

On the question, which lay at the bottom of all Scholastic Theologizing, the relation of faith to reason and philosophy Hugo of S. Victor thus determined:

Some things are *ex ratione* (out of or from reason); some according to reason; some above reason; and besides these, those which are against reason. Those things, which are *ex ratione* are necessary; those according to reason are probable; those above reason *mirabilia* or wonderful; those against reason incredible. The two extremes do not comprehend faith at all. For those things which are the product of reason are entirely known and cannot be *believed*, because they are *known*. But those which are against reason can in like manner by no reason be believed, since they do not contain any reason, nor does any reason acquiesce in them. Therefore those which are according to reason, and those, which are above reason, alone entertain faith. And in the first genus indeed faith is assisted by reason, and reason is perfected by faith, since the things which are believed are according to reason. The truth of which things if reason does not comprehend, yet it does not contradict faith in them. In those things, which are above reason, faith is not assisted by any reason, since reason does not lay hold of the things, which faith believes, and yet there is something, by which reason is admonished to venerate faith, which it does not comprehend. Those things, which are said according to reason, were probable to reason, and it freely acquiesced in them. But those things which were above reason have proceeded from Divine revelation, and reason did not work in them, but yet it was repressed (*castigata*) lest it should strive to reach them.

This seems to be a sound statement, which is not ob-

solete with those, who truly accept a revelation that comes from GOD. The statement of Richard of S. Victor is more complicated, but agrees in substance with that of Hugo.

In the first period of Scholastic history, there were those who severely noted the wearying and unprofitable method of subtle distinctions, and idle questions which are found everywhere in the writings of the Schoolmen of all the periods. One of the most severe of these castigators was Walter of S. Victor (fl. about 1180), who wrote a work entitled "Four Books against heresies manifest and even condemned in Councils, which the Sophists Abaelard, Lombard, Peter of Pictavium, and Gilbert Porretanus, the four labyrinths of Gaul, blown up by one Aristotelian spirit, in the books of their sentences, sharpen, polish, strengthen." A few words taken from the work will be sufficient as a specimen of this satirical diatribe.

Do you ask, what the labyrinth may have been in which the Minotaur was shut up? Do you ask what the Minotaur was? He is not a man nor one of the cattle; he is one of the cattle, he is a man, and yet he is neither. Do you ask what these things mean? Such is their CHRIST, the beloved phantastic GOD. He is not man, not GOD; he is GOD, He is man, and yet neuter. And each Samaritan makes his own god. But Thou O Christian, true Israelite of the true GOD, flee from these bullocks of gold, which they impiously from their own hearts propose to Christians. Puff out their disputations, which are indeed most subtle, as you would the rotten and wholly useless webs of spiders, in which also the demons play with the bullocks of Samaria, and only buzzing flies, that is, the sons of perdition are ensnared unto death. * * * Nevertheless we condemn and excommunicate their atoms, and the rules of philosophers, and the *quid*, and the *aliquid*, and other ridiculous things of this kind, saying with the Apostle: If any one preaches to you any other Gospel, whether we, or an angel, or Peter, let him be anathema. For not in the Divine Scriptures any where are found ravings of this character. So although nothing is more subtle than spider's webs, nothing sharper than the spikes of ears of grain, of which sort are the ingenuities and arguments of Demons by the mouths of heretics, nevertheless, as saith Ambrose in Hexaem, they are rather to be rejected with scorn by Catholics, than read, since all, saith He, that is born of GOD overcometh the world. And this is the victory, which overcomes the world,

our faith; we do not *think* the FATHER, and His SON JESUS CHRIST with skin and flesh, bones and nerves, soul and mind and truth of the whole man, and the HOLY SPIRIT, but unhesitatingly *believe* (them) hold, adore, whence GOD is *per omnia saecula saeculorum*, Amen.

A most vigorous rebuke this, by a contemporary, of the petty, trifling, and destructive logic of the schoolmen, in which kind of discussion the greatest of them even indulged.

John of Salisbury the friend of Becket and Bishop of Chartres, (died about 1182) perceived and noted this degenerate use of logic by the schoolmen. It had become empty formalism with few grains of material knowledge. He describes satirically the school of a certain Cornificius. All classical antiquity was banned in the school. Philosophers were made to order, and most suddenly. "Lo all things were made new; grammar was made new, dialectic was changed, rhetoric was despised, and they brought forth from the very sanctuaries of philosophy, new ways of the entire *quadrivium*, the rules of the former teachers having been annulled; they discoursed of convenience alone without reason; argument was resonant in the mouth of all; and to name an ass or a man, or any of the works of nature, was equivalent to crime, or too inapt or rude, and wholly alien from a philosopher."

In the last stage of Scholasticism, such questions as these were mooted, "Whether the proposition is possible, GOD the FATHER hates the Son? Whether GOD can take the form of a woman, of the devil, of an ass, of a cucumber, of a piece of flint? Then how would a cucumber preach, perform miracles, be affixed to a cross? And what would Peter have consecrated, if he had consecrated in the time in which CHRIST hung upon the cross?" "There are" says Erasmus, "innumerable subtle trifles also more subtle than these, concurring notions, formalities, quiddities, eccities, which no one can reach with his eyes, unless like Lynceus, he can see those things which are no where, even through the deepest darkness." Such trifling questions were applied, for the exercise of a strange subtilty, to the holiest truths of Religion, to the channels of original sin, to the manner and measure and

time in which CHRIST was completed in the Virgin's womb; in what way in the Eucharist accidents subsist without a lodging place. Such questions as these last, Erasmus says, were thought worthy of great, and as they call them, illuminated Theologians. The exercise of logical subtilty was the constant employment of all the scholastics, and in such a state of things, it is not wonderful that logical triumph might often displace the elucidation of the truth.

Alexander of Hales permitted himself to indulge in such logical trifling in sacred things. He inquires whether Mary could be better than she was? Whether one could wish the Martyrs had not died? Ought CHRIST to weep over the fall of Jerusalem, which God had decreed? Ought one to wish that the Godless should not be punished? Did the Devil wag the tongue of the Serpent, or did the Serpent itself? He gives the information that Adam sinned in the evening about the ninth hour, on the ground that CHRIST at that hour died.' "All this is treated *pro* and *contra*; all disputed through according to the rules of Art."

Such questions also Albert the Great entertained; as whether the morning knowledge of the Angels is better than that of the evening? Even Augustine had put this question. The answer seems to have been that the morning knowledge was better because it was the pure knowledge of the Angels through participation in the Divine Logos; while the evening knowledge was empirical knowledge after the entrance of existing things. Other questions of Albert's are, whether all Demons fell of their own free will, or Lucifer had overpersuaded them? Whether it was harder for GOD to create a world or to justify a man? etc.

Such questions as these from those, who were the expounders of a vast scheme of Christian Theology, was a belittling of their office, and opened the way more and more widely to that flood of scepticism in which scholasticism found its death.

Alexander of Hales just mentioned may be regarded as the first Schoolman of the second period. He was

named the Doctor Irrefragabilis, and was the first Schoolman who made a thorough use of the Aristotelian philosophy. He died A.D. 1245. He was the author of the first *Summa Theologiae*, a form of theological exposition which succeeded to the books of the Sentences. As in these Summae the scholastic method received its finished form, it is well here to describe the method. The whole of Christian theology was, in these Summae, dismembered and anatomized. It was divided into questions, and these into Articles, in which were represented the divisions, subdivisions and constituents of the subjects that were severally in discussion. The question contained the general subject; the Articles, its several parts and members. Under each Article all the objections to the view the writer meant to advocate and establish were ingeniously and minutely stated. Then came a sentence from Scripture, or a father, or from the "philosopher" "contra" against these views of the objectors. Then followed the conclusion stated and drawn out, of the Author of *Summa*; and finally one by one the objections first stated, are answered, and the crown is thus placed upon the whole work employed about the Question. This same unvarying method is followed through folio after folio of these *summae* of the Great Doctors, till the whole range of Christian truth is explored, analyzed and established according to the infallible tradition of the Church, and in agreement with the philosophy applied to its elucidation, or made to conform to its requirements. The other great Schoolmen immediately following Alexander de Hales were Albertus Magnus called from his great learning in Philosophy and all the learning of the times, Simia Aristotelis; his great pupil Thomas Aquinas, Doctor Angelicus; John of Fidenza, better known as Bonaventura, one, of whom it was said, that in him Adam had not sinned. He was Doctor Seraphicus. He united decided views of mystical theology—of approach to God and union with Him in mystical contemplation with the methods and views of a speculative theology. Thomas Aquinas was a theologian of pure speculation—with him the end of man was

the intellectual vision of God, though in his personal life he was a faithful and devout Christian. Duns Scotus the Franciscan, Doctor Subtilis, was the antipodes of Aquinas in Theology. His forte and employment was theological criticism, and though accepting the received theology of the Church, he departed widely from the interpretations of it given by Thomas Aquinas. Thus originated the theological separation of the Dominicans and Franciscans, which has perpetuated itself in the Roman Church. The Dominicans were scientific, and the Franciscans practical in their theological statements. The style of Scotus is dark and barbarous. "He introduced a number of barbarous technical terms, such as *quidditates*, *haecceitates*, *incircum-scriptibilitates*, etc.; with these began the degeneracy of scholasticism into hair-splitting subtleties." That he thus, as well as by his free handling of religious topics, regardless of the established principles of moral science, contributed to the downfall which came at last of scholastic theological methods there can be no doubt. He stood in fact in the middle of the history of Scholasticism in point of time, on the pinnacle, from which, when it had been scaled, the descent began.

The third and last period of Scholasticism began with two distinguished men, Durand of S. Pourcian Doctor Resolutissimus from 1313, teacher of Theology at Paris, then Master of the Sacred Palace, and from 1326, Bishop of Meaux; and the Franciscan William Occam, from 1322, Provincial in England, after 1328 in the court of Lewis the Bavarian, died 1347, Doctor *singularis et invincibilis*, *Venerabilis Inceptor*. Durand of S. Pourcain was a most noted Schoolman and a Dominican, but he abandoned the doctrine of Aquinas, and became the first Nominalist of the Dominican order. His views were destructive of all alliance between philosophy and Religion. His Nominalism set aside every claim of the understanding, and of mystical intuition to obtain the knowledge of Divine things. All belief was founded in Scripture, and all belief in Scripture was belief in Rome, and this belief was above everything that was provable. He rejected the assumption of Thomas that man could prove

the suitableness of belief, or supply it by mystical inspiration, and he would not with Thomas grant, that the doctrines of the Faith could contain nothing impossible, referring to the doctrine of the Trinity, which in fact had in it an impossibility, and he declared that the merit of faith increased with its difficulty. He declares that Theology is not entitled to the name of a science. The theoretical side of Theology he renounced, recognizing as a compensation, the conception of it as a practical discipline. GOD could not be the subject of Theology, for then he would be subject to predicates, and the Infinite One must enter into our finite spirit. Though GOD is the subject of its doctrines, it is GOD not as He is in Himself, but in his relation to creatures, so far as the knowledge of this relation conduces to the salvation of man. The knowledge of GOD, as it will be attained at last, is reached not by an act of understanding, but by one of will. An abstract knowledge of GOD is denied, His being is not presented in the sensible world, the supernatural cannot be represented in the natural. Only in the infallible Church, and in the submission to it of the will is the truth to be obtained. Durand's views of the doctrines and sacraments of Religion are accordant with those of Scotus, and he is noted for his clear statement of the most difficult propositions.

William Occam was the last of the distinguished Nominalists, and he carried the principles of his philosophy into his religion to the largest extent. All external nature in his view was only phenomenal. He rejected all proof from nature of the being of GOD, and accepted all the doctrines of Christianity solely on the authority of the Church. And for those doctrines, which were not contained in the New Testament he referred to later revelations made to the Church. To this later revelation he ascribed the doctrine of Transubstantiation, as Gerson did the doctrines of Purgatory, of the Assumption of Mary and of her Immaculate conception. Occam was a strenuous advocate of the rights of the state against the encroachments of the Papacy, and was imprisoned for his resistance of the Pope. He escaped and fled to the

protection of Lewis of Bavaria, telling him, "You defend me with your sword and I will defend you with my pen"

But though he denied the possibility of proving Religion by the use of Logic and philosophy, in his *Quod Libita*, he took up the doctrines of the Faith, and subjected them to the cross fire of logical examination, reducing them, one by one, to the sphere of the unintelligible and the self-contradictory.* "Instead of conceding the possibility of a knowledge of the necessity or fitness of the Incarnation, he maintains, in *centilogium theologicum, conclusio* 6, 7. *Deus potest assumere omnem creaturam sine omni aliud in unitate suppositi*. Faith, it is true, teaches that He assumed one nature alone, namely, the human; but *non includit contradictionem, Deum assumere naturam asininam—et pari ratione potest assumere lapidem et lignum*, etc. With the utmost frivolity and indifference to all religious interests, he then investigates, what significance the doctrine of the *Communicatio Idiomatum* would retain, and what results would follow, if GOD had assumed such another nature. He adduces the arguments *pro* and *contra*; and at last ends with saying, that in view of the *potentia absoluta* of GOD, the most absurd statements have a certain truth; though the *potentia ordinata*, as it is taught by the Church, sets a limit to such absurdities. As the *Communicatio Idiomatum* may be hypothetically extended to irrational inanimate beings, so, he goes on to say (Cent. Concl. 13), may it be extended to the individual parts of CHRIST, with quite as much truth and right as to the human nature in general:—one might, therefore, say—CHRIST'S head is CHRIST'S foot; CHRIST'S eye is CHRIST'S hand. *Sicut est haec (propositio) vera; Deus est homo ratione assumptionis naturae sic haec est vera; Deus est caput ratione consimilis assumptionis. Et consimiliter potest probari, quod—Deus est pes. Tunc sic; iste Deus est pes Christi, iste Deus est caput Christi, ergo caput Christi est pes Christi*. After having discussed the reasons for and against in detail, and decided that such propositions

*Dorney on the *Person of CHRIST*. Division II., Vol. I. pp. 450, 451.

are true, he says,—“Some, indeed, maintain that the *Communicatio Idiomatum* did not take place relatively to the ‘assumptio’ of such individual parts; but still it is probably to be conceded. Let each choose what pleases him best.” And by the same logical process he proceeds to demolish other Christian propositions of doctrine.

He used the weapons which Scholasticism put into his hands. Well has it been said, “As he manifests no interest whatever in the religious bearing of the matter, and gives the reins to his logic, it is doubtful whether he were merely desirous of exhibiting his logical skill in a piquant manner, or whether he wished to lay bare the contradictions in the doctrine of the Church. At all events, he was bent on overthrowing every imagination of being able to know anything in the sphere of faith.” And thus did Scholasticism justly reach its end by demonstrating its own possible uselessness to the purposes and truths of Religion. Occam’s displays were a splendid illustration of the position that had been announced by the defenders of Nominalism, that what was true in religion might be false in logic and philosophy, and utterly ignored the efforts of the Schoolmen, who had aimed to bring logic and philosophy to the demonstration of Religion in the eyes of unbelievers, and to the confirmation of the minds of believers.

Gabriel Biel, who died 1495, was the last of the more eminent Schoolmen. He set himself against some of the most pronounced doctrines of the Roman development of his time, and among his more remarkable works is an unfinished collection from Occam in Lib. IV. *Sententiarum*. The work of Scholastic Theology was done, and it remains to see what results of permanence it has left behind, what are the works of good or evil which follow it.

Certainly it must be granted that Scholasticism, in its methods and productions, was a unique and a quite remarkable manifestation of the workings of the human intellect. It is a monument, in its history, of the resources of that intellect worthy of inspection and study in all

time. Its untiring patience in the invention of arguments and distinctions in the support of conclusions, which were anticipated and prejudged, its burrowing with the keenness of thought into the purlieus, the turnings and windings of all the questions, which it considered, its mustering of objections, and its triumphant refutation of them, its imperious conclusions, its exhibition of topics in all their bearings, must awaken admiration, though it be tedious to pursue it through all its thorny syllogisms.

It was true to the traditional doctrine of the Church in its day, in all the divergences of its teachers, in the most sceptical as well as in its rigidly orthodox doctors. The Pantheist, the free thinker, and the defender of the most orthodox doctrine, were at home in it, were alike in their professed acceptance of the determinations of the infallible Church. The Scholastics all acknowledged the inspiration and the supremacy of the Holy Scriptures, but their interpretation of Scripture was the authority of the Holy See. Their exegesis was that, and that only, which was accepted, established and allowed. The independent exegetes were few and far between. Realists and Nominalists, Dominicans and Franciscans, Aquinas and Occam were here on the same platform. Agnostics and worshippers of the living and true God were one in their recognition of the final authority of the Church. Their acceptance of the Christianity, which had come to them from the Eccumenical Councils, which are universally acknowledged, was universal, and unanimous. The ancient Creeds were untouched, and the work of the Scholastics was to explain and illustrate them, by the principles of logic and philosophy, or by denying the application and use of philosophy in their interpretation. *Credo quia impossibile* was the avowed principle of the sceptical members of the scholastic brotherhood.

But how much did they effect in their exposition of the doctrines of universal Christendom? It must be admitted, and it may be maintained, that they have added nothing of clearness, or luminous definition, to the immortal declarations of the ages of the great Councils, and to the expositions of the Doctors of those ages, the expo-

sitions of Basil, the Gregories, the Jeromes and the Augustines. They themselves have acknowledged this. Says Raymond Lull, speaking of the doctrine of the Trinity, "As (and much more without any comparison) your taste (of a drop of sea water) does not comprehend all the water of the sea." And again he says, "When I am ascending to the grade in which you are, by *understanding*, you are ascending, by *believing*, to a higher grade above me." And Aquinas the greatest of the Schoolmen, when addressing himself to the demonstration of the doctrine of the Trinity, says, "When the Trinity is given, reasons of this character correspond to it." The analogies, which they use, an Abaelard, an Aquinas, a Hugo, are the same with those of an Augustine. And these analogies, whether taken from the faculties and possessions of the human mind, from power and wisdom and love, from the persons of Grammar, from the members of the syllogism, from the works of art, from the brass of the seal, from the seal itself, and from the impression which it makes, all fail to render any more clear the substance of three Persons in the one Eternal Godhead, or to penetrate beneath the definitions of the Constantinopolitan Creed into a perception of the real existence of God Triune. And similar remarks may be made with regard to the attempts to analyze the Incarnation, and to explain how the Divine and Human Natures are united in one Divine Personality. "The Word was made flesh" is still unsolved and as insoluble, as it was in the day of its first revelation. It may be granted that all the doctrines of Divine Revelation, as they are embodied in the Creeds, were unchanged in the expositions of the Schoolmen, for these doctrines were the subjects of their inquiry and investigation, and to confirm and establish them was the object ever in view. But their treatment of the doctrines was purely speculative and intellectual. The work of Thomas Aquinas is a massive structure of intellectual power, but cold as a palace of ice.

It was needful therefore that some application of these doctrines should be made to the requirements and needs of the Christian Life. And this application was sought

in a twofold way, the way of the purely speculative, and the way of the Mystics. And it was the work of the speculative Schoolmen to find this harbor for the truth, of which they were the expounders. Their channel of application was the vicegerency and Sacraments of the Church. And in this part of their work, they were veritable constructionists. They took the system of the Church as they found it, as it came down to them with all its gatherings of the Christian ages. And in doing this, they became inventors and constructors. They consolidated, by their speculations, the entire system of the Church of their day with all its additions to the Faith and Discipline once for all delivered, into a compact body of doctrine, and where it had not reached the acme of its development, they placed upon it its crown. And beyond their constructions it has not advanced to our own day. The decisions of this century of the infallible Pope have their counterpart in the teachings of the Schoolmen. They, especially the angelical Doctor, completed the system of Rome, and the infallible decisions have only sanctioned their constructions, and in doing this have rendered equal justice to the Dominicans and the Franciscans, in whose schools the doctrines of the Rome of to-day were perfected. And therefore his holiness Leo XIII., has well interpreted the genius of the Church, of which he is the head, in declaring the *Summa* of Aquinas to be the accepted text Book of Roman Theology. Thomas Aquinas was the first to declare the doctrine of the Papal infallibility in matters of faith. He bases it upon the promise of the HOLY SPIRIT to guide the Church into all truth, S. John xvi. and upon the promise to Peter in S. Luke xxii, 32. The Romish doctrine of the Sacraments was invented and completed by the Schoolmen from Lombard to Thomas Aquinas. Their number was fixed to adapt them to all stages of the Christian life. An efficacy was attributed to them, which it is difficult to describe as any other than magical, when the Doctrine of the *Opus operatum* is combined with that of the instrumental action of the Sacraments, and with the teaching that the Sacraments *contain* the grace which they signify. To the

credit of the Franciscans it must be said that they opposed this teaching in the Council of Trent, and differed most materially from the Dominicans in their explanation of the efficacy of the Sacraments, of its seat, and of the manner in which it was exerted in the souls of recipients. The doctrine of Transubstantiation was brought to its head by the speculations of the Schoolmen. They put forth all their energy in its explanation. They made distinctions, which till then had never appeared in philosophy, as these distinctions are set forth in their evident self-contradiction by one of the Schoolmen themselves—William Occam. He received the doctrine with all the contradictions against it, which he alleged, on the ground that though nowhere in the Scriptures, it was a later revelation to the Church. The doctrines of Purgatory and indulgences were completed in the thirteenth century, eminently by the angelical Doctor. The doctrine of Concomitance was expounded by Alexander de Hales, and was learnedly and most subtly defended as well as named in its final form by Aquinas. The doctrine of Penance and Confession in their Roman form was advocated and established by Aquinas the great finisher of Roman Theology. For the security of the invocation of saints and angels the scholastic terms *Latria*, *Dulia* and *Hyperdulia* were invented in the schools and learnedly defended. And Mariolatry, as it was the usual devotion of those ages by all Christians, was advocated, explained and defended by Franciscans, Dominicans and Mystics, though the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin was the peculiar treasure of the Franciscans, and has received its final authorization in the declaration of it by Pío Nono. But why proceed further in this enumeration: all the peculiar doctrines of Romanism, those above mentioned, and that of the last things, were included in the theology of the Schoolmen, and set forth with a confidence, which seems to have penetrated into the unseen world, and surveyed its territories and divisions, the Limbi of the Fathers, and of infants, Heaven, in its apartments, and the hell of the damned, and to have entered into the Council Chambers of the Eternal

One and known all His designs in the administration of the great dominion of grace and salvation. And the system of the Schoolmen thus concentrated and crystallized is the system to-day of the Roman Church. In that the Schoolmen live, and their work has there its permanence under the supervision of the infallible Vicar of CHRIST, though their books are probably now not largely consulted, and their method of elucidating theological themes has long since passed away in the dust of ages past.

Among the most noted portions of their labors are their systems of Christian ethics. This occupies a large space in the *Summa* of Aquinas. Its basis is the system of the most consummate moralist of Grecian history, Aristotle, enriched by the supernatural virtues, which Christianity has brought to light. But in his treatment of these subjects Aquinas gives a decided place to the ascetic morality of the Church of Rome, and does not give full scope to the morality best suited to the life in the world of Christian people. Full emphasis is laid on the distinction between precepts and counsels; renunciation of the world is entire deadness to it, its advantages and enjoyments, and the life of Religion is to be found in its highest state in the life of the monk and the anchorite. The sanctification of a life in worldly society, using the world as not abusing it, is not adequately set forth. His exposition however of the moral character of an action as indicated by the intention and the intensity of the will in its performance is worthy of all praise, and liable to no just exception. But the moral teaching of Duns Scotus, who differed in most points from Aquinas is not only defective but manifestly false. He makes *right* the offspring of the arbitrary will of GOD, and gives no other criterion by which right can be separated from wrong; and this view affects radically his difference from Aquinas on the subject of the Atonement of CHRIST, to which he attributes neither moral necessity, nor aught more than accidental occurrence, the accident, that is, of the arbitrary will and appointment of GOD. He is moreover a Semi-Pelagian in his anthropology, and denies that the nature of man is in a different condition after the fall from that

in which it was before the sin of our first Parent. To sum up, the Scholastic Theology lives to-day in life and action in the administration of the Roman Church, it has added no valuable elucidation to the Christian Faith; it has rather obscured the exposition of this Faith, by the thorny syllogisms and the endless subtilties, in which it has involved the Faith. It has encouraged logical conflicts in which victory rather than truth came to be sought. And it has made additions to the Christian Faith, which are no parts of its original delivery, and which materially interfere with the one Mediation between God and man, and with the access of the individual Christian, in spirit and in life, to his GOD and SAVIOUR.

The Mystics, who belonged to the schools and were of the Church have indeed combined with their speculative systems their own peculiar element of life and devotion, the Victorines, S. Bernard, Bonaventura, S. Brigitta and S. Catharine, the pupils respectively of the Franciscans and the Dominicans, and have thus kept alive a flame of devout life, but they were all wedded to the Church system of the Scholastics, and Bonaventura was an extravagant promoter of the worship of the Virgin. The others indeed were not far behind him. And even the sceptics like Occam, who undermined the teachings of the speculative theologians, by their appeal to the authority of the Scriptures above Councils and Popes opened the way for the examination of the Church's system, which led to the Reformation, to the return of the ways and beliefs of the ancient Church. The humanists also broke in upon the repulsive method of teaching adopted by the Schoolmen; of their influence Erasmus is an illustrious example. The days of the Pre-Reformers and the Reformers followed upon the exhausted labors of the Schoolmen, and the face of ancient Christianity began once more to be discerned and welcomed. And the survey of the history of Scholastic Theology teaches us to prize more deeply, and to draw more closely to our hearts the form and the substance of the Christianity, which has upon it, the imprimatur of original delivery as contained in the Holy Scriptures,

and of the *Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus* in the ages of the Church.

And finally it may be remarked that the contentions of the Scholastics are, in their substance, renewed in our own day. The same questions concerning GOD, the Trinity, the scheme of Redemption, the origin and the final end of war are mooted. Agnosticism and Pantheism, Realism and Idealism are still subjects of debate as then they were. Explanations of the mysterious doctrines of the Faith, of the Trinity, of the Person of CHRIST, and of the modes of his access to men are still given, which are identical with those given by the schools of the middle ages. The philosophical and the religious world ever repeats itself, and amid the shifting sands of human thought, there is but one sure Divine foundation, to which men can resort that they may build thereon the structures of their eternal hope and life. "Thus saith the LORD, stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein," Jer. vi. 16. That way is the pathway of the "Faith once delivered to the Saints," unmixed with human traditions, not perverted by false philosophy, not displaced by systems of vain and fallible interpretation. If that way ye find, and "walk therein," "ye shall find rest for your souls."

SAMUEL BUEL.

THE TREASURES OF THE WHITTINGHAM LIBRARY, BALTIMORE.

A DESIRE having been expressed that there should be a general sketch given of the character of the books in the Library that Bishop Whittingham left to his Diocese, the Editor of the AMERICAN CHURCH REVIEW suggested that a short article should be written for its pages, containing this information. It was more difficult to write this than to make a catalogue. It was desirable that a general sketch of the subjects and of the classification of the books should be given, and only individual books noticed for their rarity or edition. This is all that has been arrived at in preparing the following very condensed catalogue of the *Maryland Episcopal Stinnecke Library*, so named by its founder to perpetuate the name of one who left a legacy which helped to erect the building in which the library is stored.

The Maryland Episcopal Stinnecke Library consists of about 15,000 volumes, and is classified for the sake of convenience and space into

FIRST STORY.

Dictionaries and Encyclopedias;

Grammars, and Books on Languages;

Books on Law:—Roman, Civil, Canon, and Ecclesiastical;

On the Councils, the Popes, and the Jesuits;

Books on the Reformation;

The Works of English Divines;

Ecclesiastical History;

Controversialists;

The Fathers, in the Originals and Translations;

Modern History;

The Classics, and Ancient History;

Bibliography, and Letters of Literary Men;

Biblical:—the Bible in many Languages;
Commentaries on the Old Testament, the Gospels, and
the Epistles.

SECOND STORY.

Sermons, alphabetically arranged by Authors' names,
Voyages and Travels;
Biography;
Hebrew Literature;
German, French, and Italian Literature;
American Church History;—Bound Journals of Con-
ventions of all Dioceses; On the Colonial Churches, and
Chronicles of Convocation;
Bound Serials;—English, German, Italian, and Ameri-
can;
Bound Pamphlets;
On the Church and Sacraments;
On Church Polity; Confessions of Faith and Cate-
chisms;
The Romish Controversy and the Old Catholics.

THIRD STORY.

Liturgies and Liturgical Matter;
Prayer Books;
Hymn Books and Music;
Maryland History and Laws, from the Colonial Times
down to the present;

Files of newspapers and unbound pamphlets, arranged
according to subjects.

In the room given to the Records Committee of the
Convention, are their Stores; to which are added what
Bishop Whittingham left them:—

Letters of the first American Bishops and Clergy;
The Consecration Papers and Seals of three of the Mary-
land Bishops; Much historical matter, his own carefully
kept records, and the files of his own correspondence.

His Commonplace Books—a large fol., 4tos, 8vos, and
24mos, filled with his fine writing—and his many MSS.,
not yet assorted, belong to the Library.

Catalogues of three departments of the library have
been printed. 1. Of the Liturgies, and Liturgical mat-

ter, and of the Hymns. Since printing this Catalogue there have been added both by purchase and gifts such Books of Common Prayer as were needed to make the collection complete in Early Editions and Standards, and others of special note. The Standard of the Articles is here too, [1802, with Bishop White's Certificate]. Other noteworthy books in this department are the two *Pontificals* [1520 and 1596,]; the *Salisbury Prymer* 1542, *Queen Elizabeth's Book of Prayers*, 1590.

2. The Catalogue of the Classics shows what is in that department. The Aldine *Cicero* in four volumes fol. is "rare," also the *Organum Aristotelis*, Bebelius, 1536, and *De Arte Rhetorica*, Frobens, 1529.

3. The third Catalogue is of the works of the Fathers, and of Patristics generally, and contains an index to the two hundred and twenty-one volumes of Migne's *Patrologia Latina*. In this department are to be noted:—Zacagni, *Collectanea Monumentorum Veterum Eccl.: Græcae et Latinae*, Rome, 1698. *Chrysostomi, Opera*, Norton ed. 1613, in eight volumes fol. *Eusebii, Theodoretii et Evagrii Historia*, three volumes fol. Paris 1659, Valesius ed. [with book-plate of Samuel Parr, and marked R. Wilberforce to Henry G. Wilberforce]. The *Epistles of S. Clement of Rome* Græce, edited by Philotheus Bryennius, Constantinople, 1875. There is also an edition of *Thomas Aquinas* among the Incunabula, [1481]. In this catalogue, too, is given a list of the Incunabula of the Library—twenty-two books in all, printed before the year 1500.

Under the head of "Divines of the Church of England," it is necessary only to mention those that are either first editions, or have some special note of rarity. In a library like this, it is fair to suppose that any well-known Divine can be sought. First editions are marked with an †.

† *Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity*, fol. London, 1594.

† *Mason's Consecration of Bishops*, fol. Robert Barker, London, 1613.

† *Leigh's Body of Divinity*, fol. 1654.

† *Montague's Acts and Monuments*, fol. London, 1642.

De Antiq. Brit: Eccles: [known as *Parker's*, really by *Josselyn*, his Secretary] "liber rarissimus," with autograph of Archbishop Parker.

† *Stillingfleet's Origines Brit:* fol. 1685.

† *Inett's Supplement* to *Stillingfleet*, fol. 1704.

† *Butler's Analogy*. London, 4to 1736. "Olim penes Rev: Episc. Seabury, W. R.W." [With Notes in Bishop Seabury's handwriting].

In Ecclesiastical History—all the usual writers are to be found—*Mosheim, Fleury, Arnold, Schröckh, etc.*

† *Baronii Annales*. 12 vols. fol. 1593.

Ant. Pagii Critica An. Baronii. 4 vols. fol. 1705.

† *Spondani Annalium Baronii Critica*, 2 vol. fol. 1648.

De Republica Eccl. liber M. A. de Dominis (Archbishop of Spalato, in Dalmatia, and Dean of Windsor), apud Jo. Billium, fol. 1617. (rare).

The works of *Bellarmino, Lambertinus, Petavius, Cardinal Perron, Casaubon, Cardinal Pole, Basnage, etc.*

† *Answer of Isaac Casaubon to Cardinal Perron*, sm. 4to. London, 1612. Afterwards reprinted in fac-simile by W. R. W. and the Rev. Hall Harrison, at Baltimore, in 1875.

Modern History is represented by the older writers. The works of *Thuanus* in two editions, *Bede, M. Paris, Rapin, Spelman, Camden, Lingard, Oldmixon, and Turner*, for England; and *Thomasi Smithi Angli De Republica Anglorum*, 32mo, Lugd. Batavia Elzevieriano, 1625.

Roger Ascham, Familiar Letters of, Hanoviae, 1610. *O'Conor's Rerum Hibernicarum Scriptores*. Buckingham, 1vol. gr. 4to, 1814.

The Old Chronicles of *Holinshed, Hall, Grafton, Froissart, Fabyan, Fuller, Monstrelet, etc.* 22 volumes gr. 4to, the later ones from the Hafod Press, London.

26 volumes of the *Chronicles and Memorials of England*, published under the direction of the Master of the Rolls—and Parliamentary Reports.

Belonging more especially to English Ecclesiastical History and Canon Law, the following are to be noted:

A necessary Doctrine and erudition for any Chrysten

man, set forth by the Kyngs maiesty of England, (blk. letter). 12mo 1534.

Capitula sive Constitutiones Ecclesiasticae per Archiepiscopum, Episcopos et reliquium Clerum Cantuarensis provinciae, Anno Domini, 1597. 4to Londini, C. Barker, 1597.

Constitution and Canons Ecclesiastical, treated upon by the Bishop of London, President of the Convocation for the Province of Canterbury, and the rest of the Bishops and Clergie of the said province, (blk letter) 4to London, R. Barker, 1604. ("The original edition of the Canons of 1604. W.R.W.")

Other books relating to the History of England, Civil and Ecclesiastical, too important to be omitted, are a copy of *Camden's Remaines Concerning Britaine* (with Byrd of Westover's bookplate and Archbishop Carroll's autograph). London, 1623.

† *James I, Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance.* sm. 4to. Barker, 1609.

† *The State of Chrystendom*, by Sir Henry Wotton, 1657. fol.

Cabala, sive Scrinia Sacra, Mysteries of Church and State. [The title of this book was doubtless suggested by the coincidence of the initials of the names of the five ministers of Charles II., being the same as in the word Cabal, which before that time had been taken to mean a conspiracy of rogues. The observation in Lowndes Manual is either absurd or meaningless].

Mélanges Historique de Camusat ["a very rare book of much value in the history of the English Reformation. Vide Clement Bibl. Curieuse. W.R.W."]

In Bibliography, there are very many works. *Fabricius* for the Classics, *Panzer* for Incunabula, *Clement* for curious editions, etc., *Walchius* for Patristics, *Winer* for Ecclesiastical History, *Wood's Athenae* for Oxford writers, *D'Herbelot* for Oriental Literature, and *Le Long's Bibliotheca Sacra*, *Cavé's Literaria*, etc.

Lambecii Comment: de Bibl: Vindobonensi, 5 vol. fol. 1766.

Bibliotheca Coisliniana, sive MSS. omnium Graecorum

accurata descriptio. B. de Montfawcon, fol. Paris, 1715.

Lyceum Lateranense, Abbas de Rosini. Caesenaë, fol. 1602.

Scriptores Rerum Germanarum, 3 vol. fol.

Letters of Literary Men—of *Hugo*, *Grotius*, *Gudaeus*, *Pithoeus*, *Puteanus*, *Erasmus*, *Leibnitz*, *Lipsius*, *Hoescheli*, *Heineius*, *Gronovius*, *Fronton*, *Casaubon*, etc.

There are also some literary curiosities placed here for want of space elsewhere. The sermons of *Pelbartus de Themeswar*, 2 vols. fol., of *Humbertus*, and of *Johannes Nider*; all black letter, and not placed among the incunabula, either because the exact date could not be ascertained, or because the date was beyond the year 1500.

Fratris Hieronymi Savonarolae Ferrariensis expos-in Psalmos. 18mo Venetiis, 1524.

Frat. Hier. Savon. Ferrariensis Triumphus Crucis. 18mo Venetiis, 1517.

Both have the same wood cut of the saint in his cell, only in the later work it is reversed.

There are about one hundred and fifty books on Law. *Calderin's Repertorium Juris* and the *Justinian Code* are among the Incunabula. There are two copies of the *Theodosian Code*—ed. *Gothofredus*—and *Canones Gratiani*, also the works of *Beveridge*, *Van Espen*, *Fabronius*, *Lupus*, *Suarez*, and others.

Besides Civil or Roman Law, and Ecclesiastical Law proper, there are the Laws or Canons of the different Churches, as well as of different lands.

On the Popes—the claims of the Papacy, the Jesuits and their history, there are many books. The collector of the library was a special student in the controversy with Rome. There are copies of the *Indices Librorum Expurgandorum* from a folio down to an 18mo—one of which, a 12mo, is very rare—there are only two copies known. This copy was collated with the other copy in the Bodleian Library by the Bishop himself in 1852. It is described in Mendham's *Literary Policy of the Church of Rome*—2d edition, pp. 116–133 and supplement, pp. 22–25; also in Clement's *Bibliothèque Curieuse* (marked “liber rarissimus.”)

In the department of Councils, Synods, etc., there are about two hundred books, seventy of which are on the Council of Trent alone. A noteworthy book is, *De Concilio Liber Reginaldi Poli, Card.* Apud P. Manutium Aldi F. Sm. 4to. "Extremely rare. The first book which Paul Manutius printed at Rome."

There are four copies of the History of the Council of Trent by Father Paul Sarpi: *Historio del Concilio Tridentino*—appresso Giovanni Billio, Regio Stampatori, Londini, 1619. (Dedicated to King James I. by M. A. de Dominis). The second edition of the same; also Newton's and Bishop Bedell's translation into Latin, and Brent's English Translation.

Interdicti Veneti Historia, Sarpi. Canterbrigiae, 1626, besides other documents belonging to that period and to the dispute of Paul V. with the Republic of Venice. It is convenient to mention here that the library contains several books relating to the famous Archbishop of Spalato,—the one best worth mentioning seems to be: *The Bishop of Spalato (sic) his shiftings in Religion.* 4to, Lond. John Bill, 1644.

The collection of books relating to the Reformation is not only very large, but contains some rare first editions. There is a copy of the first edition of the collected works of Martin Luther: *Martini Lutheri Opera Omnia cum prefatione N. Amsdorfii.* 4 tomi fol. Jenae 1586–8. First impressions of separate works are: *Von ordnung Gottesdient yn der gemeyne.* Wittenberg. 1523. *Von der Freiheit eines Christen Menschen.* Wittenberg, 1520. *Epistolarum* Tomus primus (ab anno 1507 ad annum 1522) Jhenae. 1556. Of Melancthon, the following are to be seen: *Consilia sive Judicia Theologica,* etc. Collecta C. Pezelii. 12mo, Neustadii, 1600 (a very rare book). There are also *Calvin's Letters and Life,* edited by Theodore Beza, Lausanae, 1576. One book of peculiar rarity contains the reasons of the pröbste (provosts) of the Churches of S. Lawrence and S. Sebals in Nuremberg for certain ecclesiastical changes. *Getrucktzu Nürnberg durch Hieronymi Höltzel* in Jar MDXXIII. A note by W. R. W. informs us that this is a copy of the

first edition of this tract. To this may be properly joined *Eyn Ratschlag über den Artikeln zu Nürnberg* 1525.

There is a very full collection of Confessions and Symbolical Books, among them: *Collectio Confessionum in Ecclesiis Reformatis publicatarum*. Edidit Niemeyer. 8vo Lipsiae, 1840. *Declaration of the Faith*, etc., agreed upon by their Elders and Messengers, in their meeting at the Savoy, October 12, 1658. 4to. London, 1659.

An Ordinance of the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament. For the Calling of an Assembly of learned and godly Divines, to be consulted with by the Parliament for the settling of the Government and Liturgy of the Church of England. 4to. London, 1658. (With Westminster Confession of Faith and Larger Catechism).

Catechismus oder Kinderpredig.

“ der stat Nürnberg. 12mo. s.l. 1533, (with curious woodcuts).

Laws and Statutes of Geneva, translated out of the French tongue, etc. 4to. London, 1643.

The Government and Order of the Church of Scotland. 4to. Edinburgh, 1641.

Baptist Confession of Faith—set forth in 1742. Phila., 1765.

Methodist Discipline—set forth in the Conference of 1784. Baltimore, 1791.

In the Biblical Department are Bibles, or parts of the Bible in various languages, among which are worthy of special note the *Pauline Epistles in Syriac*, edited by Widmanstadt and printed in 1555. *Gutbirius' Syriac Testament*, with Lexicon, Hamburg, 1663, and the whole N. T. in Syriac with the prolegomena of Samuel Lee. The Old Testament in Hebrew, from the edition of Elias Hutterus, 1588, down to Tischendorf's pocket edition. There is also the Targum of Jonathan. *Chaldaeae Jonathanae in sex Prophetas Interpretatio* (apud C. Stephanum.) This department, too, has not been catalogued, but it has been classified, into Bibles,—and commentaries on the Old Testament, on the Gospels, and on the Epistles. Worthy of note seem to be the following:

Evangeliarium quadruplex lat: vers: antiquæ seu vet: italicæ é codd: MSS.: Ed. à J. Blanchino. 2 vols. fol. Romæ, 1749.

Psalterium Græcum, e cod. MS. Alexandrino. H. H. Baber. fol. Londini, 1812.

Bengelii Gnomon Nov. Test: Tubingen, 1850.

Synopsis Criticorum M. Poli. IV. vol; fol. London, 1671.

Catene Græcorum Patrum in Nov. Test. VIII., Tomi. Oxon, 1844.

† *Uberiores Adnotationes in Danielum, Esracam, Nehemiam, et lib. Chron.*, etc. C. B. Michaelis. J. H. Michaelis, etc., etc. 4to Halæ. et Lips—1699—1723—marked "very valuable."

Rosenmüller's Com. on the Old and N. T., 17 vols.

† *Lowth's Isaiah.* 1778,

Opera Johannis Lightfooti Omnia Latine vertit, I. Leusden, 2 vols fol. Roterdami, 1684.

Among Harmonies is the following:

Harmonia Juxta sectiones Ammonianas et Eusebii Canones. Oxon 1805.

A late gift to the library is a copy of the 1st American edition of the Bible, printed by recommendation of Congress, with the approval of its two Chaplains, W. White and G. Duffield, printed by P. Aiken. Phila., 1782. In the second story are four hundred volumes of Sermons, with the Bampton, Boyle, and other Lectures.

There are about three hundred and fifty Biographies, besides several sets of Biographical Dictionaries;

Two hundred and twenty-five bound volumes of Convention Journals;

And three hundred bound volumes of Pamphlets—historical, political, literary, polemical, etc., of Church and State.

The history, literature, philosophy and controversy of the post-biblical Jews, and the studies and researches of Christian scholars in the language, history, laws and traditions of the Jews, are illustrated in various books. There are treatises of *Maimonedes*. *J. C. Wolf's Notitia Karaiorum*, bound with *J. T. glandü Dissertatio de*

Karæsis. Buxtorf the elder is represented by his *Synagoga Judaica*, and by his treatise *De Abbreviaturis Hebraicis* in the same volume with the *Operis Talmudici brevis recensio*, and also the *Bibliotheca Babinica*. Buxtorf the son has *Exercitationes in Historiam*. Other books in this division are:— *De decem viris otiosis*. C. Vitringa. 4to. Francquærae, 1687. *De Synedriis* J. Selden. 3 vols. 4to. London, 1650. *De modis allegandi S. S.*, etc. G. Surenhusius. 4to. Amstel, 1713.

One section of the Library is appropriated to German books—relating not only to the Reformation, but to the laws, institutions and usages of the Holy Roman Empire, and the literary and political history of the German race. There are several volumes devoted to the art, literature, and antiquities of Nuremberg. One volume contains the history of the Controversy between the city of Nuremberg and the Margraves of Brandenburg as Burggraves of that City. Another contains biographical accounts of authors and artists; another, plans and views of the city. Several describe the objects of interest in the library and throughout the city. Besides these printed books, there is a manuscript chronicle of Nuremberg from early times till the year 1561. The date of writing seems to have been 1579. At the end is a vigorous ballad describing and denouncing the conduct of the Bishop of Wurzburg in making a midnight attack on the town of Graefenberg.

The books in the French language include:

Voyage historique de l'Amerique meridionale. Par. G. Juan et Don A. de Ulloa, et une histoire des Incas du Perou. 2 vols. 4to. Amst: 1752.

Description des Pyramides de Ghize et de la ville du Kaire. Par J. Grobert. 4to. Paris. An IX. (1800). Besides these books there are the *Travels of L'Abat, Chardin, Misson, Lalande*, etc.—the works of *Pascal, Bossuet, Massillon, Ste Beuve*, etc.

Among the Italian books are: *Storia Della Letteratura Italiana*. G. Tiraboschi. 20 vols. 8vo. Firenze. 1805.

Il Decameron (woodcuts). 4to Venezia. 1602.

L'Isole piu famose del mondo. T. Porcacchi. fol. Padova. 1620.

Viaggi di P. della Valle et Pelligrino. 2 vols. (First Edition). 4to. Roma. 1650. *Valle P. D. Voyages dans la Turquie*, etc. (Portraits). 3 vols. 4to. Paris. 1662.

Bembo, P. Della Istoria Veneziana da lui volgarizzata. lib. XII. 2 vols. Milano. 1809.

Bembo, P. Della Lingua Italiana. 18mo, Ven. 1556.

Petri Bembi, Patricii Venetii, Epistolæ omnes, quot quot exstant, et *opuscula.* Paulo Tertio Pont: Max. dicato. 12mo. Romæ. 1546. (Contains *De Etna*, which is very rare.

It will be seen that no notice has been taken of the Dictionaries and books in the Lingual Department, and of books on Theology—nothing but a Catalogue can tell of these—or of the Biographies and Sermons.

JOHN W. NOR

MATTERS IN DISPUTE CONCERNING "THE OLD TESTAMENT."

NOT many years ago, the discussion of theological questions, in this country, at any rate, was considered properly reserved for theological books or papers. The secular world seemed to think itself unconcerned about them. Their presence in secular literature was deemed somewhat of an intrusion.

Now, however, all this is changed, if we may base an opinion upon the fact that even the daily papers, whenever any question of interest arises in the theological world, take an active part in its discussion.

Prominent among such questions has become this:—"What view as to authorship, structure and inspiration, should be taken of that collection of books known as The Old Testament?" Or, to put the question somewhat differently and more technically:—"What is '*of faith*' concerning them?" "*What is of truth* concerning them?"

This question receives, even among Christian people, varied answers, some of which differ very materially from the view which was held almost universally, say fifty years ago; and held not unnaturally. Some,—nay, very many, perhaps most,—Christians maintain that older view which was formed when there seemed no good reason to hold any other:—before, let us say, the discoveries of the modern science of physics had demonstrated that the physical structure of the world we live in was very much longer in attaining its present condition than is assumed by the consideration that it all came about in six days of twenty-four hours each; or before the science of archæology had demonstrated that the human race had existed

for a much longer time than Archbishop Ussher's system of chronology provides for; or before the researches of philologists and comparative theologians had discovered as much as they have concerning the various religions of the world in connection or contrast with the "revelation" of the Old Testament:—in short, before men knew as much as they do now.

Any change in these old views is by such looked upon with dread as involving a denial of "the Faith", and its destruction.

The writer of this article does not share such dread: he does not believe that such denial or destruction is involved. That the denial or destruction of some, perhaps many, man-made dogmas concerning it may be involved, is true. But they had better go to the wall and relieve "the Faith" from the weight of their demonstrated inaccuracy. In order more clearly to define his position, the present writer declares that he holds and believes, *ex animo*, the Apostles', the Constantinopolitan, and (with the exception of the limited-salvation and the damnatory clauses) the Athanasian, Creeds. He does not consider the verities they express as at all dependent upon any particular "view" as to the structure or the inspiration (as that latter term is popularly understood) of the various books of the Bible known as the Old Testament. He holds, with that profound scholar and manly Christian, François Lenormant, (Preface to *The Beginning of History*, p. XI., seq.) that—

The submission of the Christian to the authority of the Church, in all that relates to those teachings of faith and morals to be drawn from the books of the Bible, does not at all interfere with the liberty of the scholar when the question comes up of deciding the character of the narratives, the interpretation to be accorded to them from the historical standpoint, their degree of originality, or the manner in which they are connected with the traditions found among other peoples who were destitute of the help of Divine inspiration; and lastly, the date and mode of composition of the various writings comprised in the sacred Canon. Here scientific criticism resumes all its rights. It is quite justified in freely approaching these various questions, and nothing stands in the way of its taking its position upon the ground of pure Science, which

demands the consideration of the Bible under the same conditions as any other book of antiquity, examining it from the same standpoints and applying to it the same critical methods. And we need fear no diminution of the real authority of our Sacred Book, from examination and discussion of this nature, provided it be made in a truly impartial spirit, as free from hostile prejudice as from narrow timidity. * * * * *

We must learn to bring the same breadth of view to this study as did the old Fathers, especially Jerome, when he wrote: '*Sive Mosen dicere volueris auctorem Pentateuchi, sive Esdram ejusdem instauratorem operis, non recuso.*'

CHRIST said, "Search the Scriptures"; and we may suppose that He meant what He said, and that the advice was a safe one to give, not only to those to whom He spoke but also as embodying a principle for all time. One thing is very certain. His course, and the following of his advice in this matter, cut at the root of much of the current "theology" of His own time. He did not hesitate to say to some of the recognized theologians of the Church as it then existed, "Ye have made the Word of GOD of none effect through your traditions"; and these "traditions" had arisen from the very attempt (too successful as it seems) to "set a fence about the law". Modern theology (or a large part of it) has succeeded in doing just what Pharisaic theology had done then, viz.:—in building the fence so solid and so high that it kept out the light of much truth from the enclosure.

Thus, history repeats itself. Now, as then, the effort to remove some of the "fence" is decried as a desecration of the sacred ground which it surrounds avowedly to preserve but really to render to a degree unfruitful.

History repeats itself in another way. On one memorable occasion, when another "fence" was being opened to let in a better light, those who opposed it could give no good reason for their opposition. All attempt to reason was drowned by the cry, long continued, "Great is Diana of the Ephesians!" How often does that cry re-voice itself now! No reason; no bringing forward weightier argument; no calm and irrefragable demonstration of an opponent's mistake; but only a yell equally deafening and senseless, based upon the not very honoring as-

sumption that what is God's real truth cannot withstand any amount of investigation and discussion! With regard to this state of things what fair and candid mind can fail to make its own the saying of an early Christian writer:—"My brethren, these things ought not so to be"?

In view of some recent statements and discussions which have aroused public interest with reference to the structure and contents of the Old Testament, it is not unnatural, all things considered, that much denunciation results. In old times there would have been a short method with offenders. The ecclesiastical authority would have handed them over to the secular arm with the hypocritical injunction to deal gently with them, i. e., roast them alive or pour molten lead down their throats, or the like. That is impossible now and here; but the inquisitorial spirit rarely is absent at such times, and is ready, if it cannot convince of, and so do away with, alleged error, to hurl anathema and excommunication instead of furnishing rebutting proof.

With a view of getting at a candid discussion of some points in dispute, and at any rate by such means evolving an intelligent understanding on the part of the public, secular and theological, of the real merits of the case, the following are propounded as some of the main questions at issue concerning the Old Testament Scriptures. It can do us no harm to "search" concerning the Scriptures as well as to "search" themselves. The questions are such as in the nature of things must be answered in one way or another. They are not and cannot be answered by mere denunciation of those who ask them: and very many people are asking them,—many more than the clergy may think; and it does incalculable harm to refuse or to be unable to answer them. If "faith" is to differ from superstition it must rest on some intelligible reason; and it is vital to the Christian to feel that his faith rests upon the reason of truth pure and simple. The result of such inquiries must be that some things in the way of "theory" or "system" or "view" which have been supposed to be "of the Faith" will be seen to be extraneous to it; and their removal from it,—that is to say, the rec-

ognition of the fact that they are extraneous to it,—will simplify but at the same time strengthen the Faith.

The ivy which covers a wall may at a distance seem to be of the very structure of the wall. More closely looked at, it is recognized to be simply clinging to it; and the removal of the ivy more clearly reveals the structure of the wall, the juncture of its stones, the massiveness of its solidity, and in no way weakens the wall.

The first question which arises in this connection is this:—

1. Has any Church (or the Authorities thereof) one of whose "Articles of Religion" has this statement concerning the books of the Bible, viz.:—"Whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be received as an article of the Faith"—any right, according to its own standards, to object to a thorough search for and declaration of what the said books of the Bible proclaim themselves to be, out of their very structure and in the light of the best knowledge which may be applied to them? If this "search" results in showing conclusively that any former theory is untenable in the light of facts, which theory is to be held as "of the truth," the theory based upon a misapprehension of the facts, or, the theory based upon a knowledge of the facts?
2. Is any dogma of "inspiration" to be received on the ground of the mere assertion of any man or set of men? or, on the ground of evidence furnished by the records themselves?
3. If "inspiration" of the Old Testament Scriptures be claimed,—and we do not deny that it exists in many portions of them,—is it a "verbal" or a "substantial" inspiration?
4. If it be a "verbal" inspiration, does it adhere to the original text, or to a translation?
5. If it adheres to the original text, then to which of the various readings of that text does it adhere?
6. Is a conclusion as to the origin and authorship of any portion of the Old Testament to be based upon the mere dictum of any individual or school? or, is it to be

based upon proof such as is relied upon in the case of other ancient records?

7. Is the best proof to rest upon any theory of the authority of mere assertion? or, upon the authority of the structure of the writings themselves, examined with all the light which can be gained from history, archæology, and philology?

8. May the records be allowed to speak for themselves? or, is their reception and meaning to depend upon an authority extraneous to them?

9. If the latter, what is the authority for such authority?

10. Are the enlightening results of modern scholarship to be disregarded, or still worse, anathematized, because they may happen to conflict with views resulting from the comparatively imperfect scholarship of former centuries?

11. If certain theories, originally framed in ignorance of facts, are shown by the advance of knowledge to be disproved by the facts, which should be held as most in the interests of truth,—an abandonment of the theories? or, a disregard of the facts?

12. At this stage of the world, is judgment concerning the material structure of such ancient documents as the several books of the Old Testament to be considered as a question of scholarship? or as a question of "faith"? If of "faith," what does "faith" mean in this connection? and on what should it rest?

13. When CHRIST commanded, "Search the Scriptures," did He really mean that? or, did He mean, simply, "Search what somebody who claims to have authority says about them"?

14. If two historical accounts of the same transaction differ in their statements, which of them is to be considered the inspired, and which the uninspired, account? Are they to be considered the work of the same, or of different authors?

15. If some books are said to be "canonical" and therefore of a certain virtue not possessed by others called "uncanonical" or "apocryphal," upon whose authority was this distinction made? Was the authority which

made this distinction inspired with plenary knowledge in the premises? If so, who says so? If not, what is the precise weight of such authority?

16. If the authorship of any collection of books, such for instance as the Books of Judges, Ruth, Kings, and Chronicles, be unknown or disputed, upon whose authority are such books decided to be of plenary inspiration, or of any inspiration?

17. What is the authority for including the anonymous story called the "Book of Esther" among the sacred, canonical, and "inspired," books of the Old Testament? especially in view of the moral of the story, (the successful issue of marital tyranny and brutality on the part of Ahasuerus), and the fact that God is not once named or alluded to from one end of the book to the other. The true nature of the command of Ahasuerus to his noble and self-respecting Queen Vashti may be understood by recurring to a single vigorous sentence of Lord Macaulay's in describing some of the horrors which one period of English rule in India inflicted upon the natives; "That the apartments of a woman of quality should be entered by strange men, or that her face should be seen by them, are in the East intolerable outrages, outrages which are more dreaded than death, and which can be expiated only by the shedding of blood." This sensitiveness existed in the East in the time of Ahasuerus as well as in the time of Sir Elijah Impey: and we read (Esther i. 10, seq.) "On the seventh day, when the heart of the King was merry with wine, he commanded * * the seven chamberlains * * * to bring Vashti the Queen before the King with the crown royal, to show the people and the princes her beauty; for she was fair to look on. But the Queen Vashti refused to come.' And no wonder, for the drunken king had commanded her to submit to what was in the East "an intolerable outrage, more dreaded than death, and which can be expiated only by the shedding of blood." The rest of the book is a record of the King's successful tyranny and the good fortune of Vashti's rival, the pretty Esther, and her uncle and kindred. And yet one theory places the story among,

and as being of the nature of, sacred, canonical, and "inspired," books! Is this not a large draft upon "Faith"?

It must be seen that the drift of such questions as the above, and which many minds are asking, involve difficulties of two kinds:—those weighing upon

1. The Intellectual sense, and
2. The Moral sense.

And yet these are difficulties only in consequence of an irrational theory of "inspiration," which theory gives infidelity many of its weapons against "the Faith."

The key, in our opinion, to the solution of the problem is this:—

Examine closely the history of the race of Israel. It comprised the multitude, together with the higher individualities of the nation which began in the family and reached the national through the tribal stage. The multitude were, like every other multitude, gross, ignorant, sensual, originally polytheistic so far as religion went, and maintained those characteristics up to a late period of their ancient history.

The higher minds,—as is the case in all history,—the more aspiring individualities, were ever working onward and upward toward a higher plane of spiritual knowledge and attainments, and striving to impress their attainments upon the mass, with varied success and oft repeated failure.

But from beginning to end, to within a few centuries before the Christian era there was a progress;—a progress so marked that the most destructive criticism of the Sacred Text cannot obscure the fact that instead of saying "ever working" onward and upward towards a higher plane of spiritual knowledge and attainments, it is more scientifically exact to say that they were "ever worked" to that aim and end by an overmastering spiritual guidance "not of themselves, and working for righteousness." This spiritual, i.e., Divine force is more apparent when we compare the final spiritual attainments of Israel with the final spiritual attainments of all antiquity up to the time alluded to above, There is nothing like it elsewhere. If the "revelation" of God be not here, it is and

has been nowhere in the world. And it is to be carefully noted that wherever else it was or was not, a "revelation" it certainly was in the national life and national progress from very low beginnings,—beginnings of polytheism and almost universal grossness,—up to the exalted heights of some of the Psalms or the magnificent evangelicalism of the Isaiahs, the earlier and later. No human power produced this; no human guidance compassed it. It was pre-eminently "GOD in history."

Here is something for a firm foundation on which to stand, a foundation unmovable. Having this, we can calmly survey the incidents of the growth, and the records which, whatever their authorship, preserve to us the knowledge of it; records bearing the impress of each successive stage of progress or of decline,—for there were vicissitudes; records of preserved traditions put together in some cases by nobody knows whom, and it needs not to know; records of history more or less colored by the individuality of the historian or the compiler; records of times of anarchy and times of more orderly settlement, records embracing even such episodes as that given in the Book of Esther as a glorification of a race whose inmost consciousness was that of being "the chosen people"; records which embody "the words of the wise and their dark sayings"; the dramatic portraiture of the problems of life and their bitterness, as in the Book of Job; beautiful pastorals, as in Ruth and the Song of Songs; fierce denunciations of unrighteousness, as in the prophetic thunderings; visions of GOD in His majesty and holiness, as in Isaiah and Ezekiel;—in all, the slow yet sure preparation for the new dispensation of grace and truth in JESUS CHRIST.

Looked at in that light, the light of national progress, under Divine guidance, from a polytheistic barbarism towards the sublimest monotheistic righteousness the world had witnessed:—the Old Testament records need cause no trouble to faith, and are at once lifted out of the sphere of cavil by foe, and of unwise—because untenable—defence by friend.

It is a vantage ground of truth, which is utterly swept

away by any such theory of inspiration as would put the ceremonial minutiae of the Code of Ezra on a par with the Sermon on the Mount; or the Book of Esther on an equality with the fifteenth chapter of S. Luke's Gospel; the calculating wisdom of Proverbs with the glowing love of the thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians; or the hopeless cynicism of Ecclesiastes with that magnificent refrain of immortal hope beginning "Now is CHRIST risen from the dead and become the first fruits of them that slept."

Most truly did a great Christian once write, "The letter killeth; but the spirit giveth life."

J. ANDREWS HARRIS.

SCRIPTURAL EVOLUTION.

THIS word Evolution has been made to do very hard service in the usage of language within the last few years, and often in such usage greatly to the confusion of thought and expression. So protean are its significations, and the facts which it is employed to describe, that one who would keep clear of confusion himself, and avoid confusing others, would do well to affix its defining adjective, dynamical, modal, teleological, material, vital, psychological, social, or ethical. The word describes a different fact or process, and consequently its contents vary, in each of these applications. Chemical properties, for instance, are spoken of as evolved out of simple matter, life as evolved out of these chemical elements, animal organisms out of vegetables, and man out of the animal. So, again, we are told of the evolution of social, philosophical, and religious systems, of scientific theories, and even of clocks, telephones, and steam engines. Sometimes, again, it describes a simple power, a force operating. Then, the process, the mode of such operation. And, then, again, the originating, controlling, and directive agency, to such force and mode of operation. In one sense or another, senses very diverse one from the other, all these are thought of, and described as Evolution.

In many of these senses, moreover, it is clear that nothing atheistic or irreligious is intended. Confining it to its most ordinary, and, indeed, its proper signification, that which makes it describe, not a force nor a contrivance, but simply a process or method, we find it frequently so used as to assert the necessity of a Divinely

originating intelligence to the evolving movement and its result. The word itself, whatever its recent atheistic associations, is theistic in its rational implications. It can only, in fact, become atheistic by some of the confusions above indicated, by importing into it a meaning which it does not properly contain. Evolution, as an orderly process, according to law, related to, and forming part of the Kosmos, cannot originate and conduct itself. There is no adequacy, in such supposition, of cause to effects and consequences. "Evolution," to use the language of President Seelye, "without a previous Involution is impossible; and to derive reason from unreason is absurd." "This," says a newspaper critic, quoting it, "is but another way of putting the old proverb; you cannot get more out of a bottle than was put in it." To the effect, the cause must be adequate. "He found," said one, speaking of Professor Henry's scientific studies, "the universe, not a chaos, but a Kosmos. This Kosmos, whether evolved through myriads of ages, or called at once into being, is the product of mind, of designing intelligence."

One perhaps of the most remarkable applications of this word, as of its variations of meaning, is that which has been made of it, with reference to the material of the Old and New Testament and their practical results, in the Institutions of Judaism and Christianity. Here, first of all, we have the two classes of theistic and atheistic, or as the latter prefer calling themselves, non-theistic evolutionists. These latter, find all the existing phenomena, both of the Scriptures themselves, and the religious Institutions of Judaism and Christianity, as the evolution of forces originally spontaneous and unintelligent. The Person, and presence, and purpose of a Divine Author are dispensed with,—if not denied, are made out to be unnecessary. The primary element is material; matter, it may be, in the highest possible expansiveness of nebulousity, but still only matter. Out of this, and originating in purely material forces, it is an evolution of results, by natural laws and processes, working outward and upward, though chemical, vital, organic, intellectual, social

and moral agencies, to what is found in the actual results. The effect, thus, in each one of these stages is greater, both in kind, and degree, than its cause. And the first and lowest upon which the rest depend, whether itself to be called a cause or an effect, or a *tertium quid*, unlike either, or partaking of the qualities of both, is entirely causeless!

This, of course, is Evolution not preceded by Involution. But, as already intimated, there are theistic as well as non-theistic evolutionists, of the order and results of Scripture as of nature. And these, again, admit among themselves of a threefold classification. There are, first, what may be called the supernatural evolutionists. These find in nature, in man individual and collective, in Scripture, in these Scriptures themselves as in their correlations, purpose, plan, progress, advance, and elevation, evolution of capacity, as of enjoyment, to results, surpassing definite aspiration. But, in such evolution there is recognized the previous involution, not only of a Divinely arranged plan, but of Divinely arranged and provided forces, agencies,—inspiration, miracles, prophecy,—not included in the ordinary course of nature, or, more properly speaking, of the naturally known Divine administration. Then, again, there are theistic evolutionists, where theism is confined simply to the origination of the universe, with its plan and forces; including, in that plan, man's religious nature and its development: thus far, most fully provided for by Christianity, moving on, however, through this, to the religion of the future. The evolution in such case, whatever, the Divine force beyond, of its origination, is a purely natural and finds its explanation, in all its parts and movements, in the operation of natural forces and agencies, those of the external world, as of man's physical, intellectual, and social being. The supernatural, thus, as unnecessary, if not incredible or impossible, is out of place. And then, again, there is a third class of theistic evolutionists, who attempt to combine the principles of the two preceding. They argue upon the principles of the second, in the language and tones of the first. Or, perhaps, more

properly speaking, they attempt, sometimes unconsciously, to enunciate the principles and theory of the second, in the language and terminology of the first. The voice is that of the God-fearing Jacob, but the hands are those of the profane Esau.

Reversing the order of these, in our examination, we begin with the third and last. Its special point of difficulty, in dealing with it, is its want of consistency. It is a house divided against itself. While for the sake of consistency it would be better for its advocates to stop using the language of the supernatural in a natural or rather non-natural sense, it would be still better if they would come up to the real meaning of such language—describe by it what, in ordinary usage, it has, all along, been understood to mean. "You tell me," says Harrington to Fellows, in the *Eclipse of Faith*, "one moment, that you do not believe in historical Christianity at all,—either its miracles or its dogmas—these are fables; but, in the next, no old Puritan could garnish his discussion with a more edifying use of the language of Scripture. As I listen to you, I seem to see a hybrid between Prynne and Voltaire. So far from its being true that you have renounced the letter of the Bible, and retained its spirit, it would be much more correct to say, that you have renounced its spirit, and retained its letter." Why should one be interlarding his language in this way: using terms that convey to ordinary apprehension the idea of supernatural agencies, "miracle," "prophecy," "revelation," "inspiration," "Divine influence," when he has only in view, or intends to describe the unintelligent operations of nature, or the ordinary exercise of human powers and faculties? If there be an intermediate in this matter, then, by all means, let there be a new terminology to describe it. This, of course, is a very different issue from that which investigates particular facts, say of Scripture, or from other sources, as to whether this or that is miracle, or only natural event? So too is it different from the effort, and disposition, inside or outside of Scripture, to minimize the supernatural, to find as little of it as possible. In both of these cases, its

presence and possibility are distinctly admitted. The difficulty with the class of writers and thinkers, of which we are now speaking, is to know exactly what they really mean; to evacuate the supernatural from their forms of expression, or to find in them more than the natural taken in their whole connection. The evolution of the Divine plan is thus sometimes apparently exhibited as purely of natural forces, as originating in those forces, productive only of that which is natural in its results and consequences. At the same time, it is freely spoken of as a Divine plan, accomplished by Divinely sent and appointed agents and messengers, and through special Divine interpositions; all this, however, in a natural way, and through the operation of mere natural forces, material, intellectual, moral and spiritual. It is thus a constant play of fast and loose, until the reader becomes as much bewildered as the writer, in regard to what is really the nature of the phenomena contemplated. Let any such thoughtful reader, for instance, attempt to construct a consistent view out of the utterances of Ewald, or of one who has drawn largely from him, Dean Stanley, as to the Divinely supernatural, in the evolution of Old and New Testament history, and he will recognize the difficulty to which allusion has been made. The language and spirit are manifestly a great and elevating advance upon those of old fashioned materialism. There is a reverential tone and manner, in many respects, very different and far more grateful. As applied, however, to the phenomena of Scripture, or compared as to its parts with itself, it is a mass of incoherencies, and often of positive inconsistencies.

This introduces us to another and more consistent class of theistic natural evolutionists. These go upon the old deistic idea of the universe and of man, combined with the modern idea of evolution. Strictly speaking, the material and the plan are Divine, the process, the evolution of the forces, the movements of the material and, in accordance with the plan, is purely natural. Old Bible forms of expression are sometimes used. But they are toned down as Orientalisms, to a natural mean-

ing. The supernatural, as not needed, has no place. The undertaking is to find a process through which physical, mental, moral and social forces operate to the evolution of Old and New Testament religions, Patriarchal, Mosaic and Christian, in a natural way, and this, too, in such a manner, as not to contradict, nor do violence to the tenor of Scripture history. Scripture evolution is thus a movement, from the lower to the higher, with no special agency of the highest, in any of its advancing stages to its final result. This at once disposes of revelation in the specific sense of the word, of inspiration except as the elevated consciousness of the saint, the poet, or the orator. The Old and the New Testament, like the Shasters or the Koran, the evolution of man's religious consciousness and its aspirations, on a much higher plane, indeed, than these others, but in kind essentially the same, enables us to trace this evolutionary process, under its most favorable conditions, to its, as yet, highest manifestation. Consistently with this conception, the process may begin with Tyndall's fiery cloud, or with La Place's attenuated nebula, or, with others, recognizing the impassible chasm between matter inorganic and organic, between mere atoms or molecules and life, a few life germs may constitute the needed point of departure. This, too, as man is reached, may include elevation from the lowest brutality, up through the earthen, the stone, the iron, and brazen epochs to that of Patriarchal nomadism or of agricultural life. Dealing with the Old Testament, however, while all these previous stages are silently assumed, the specific effort is to find, in its material, the traces of subsequent and higher evolution. Here, too, strange to say, the point of departure is not the opening chapters of Genesis, but the record of Exodus, and the condition of the Jewish people as they are found in the wilderness. Genesis, with its unmanageable material, disappears, or loses all distinct palpability, in the process of mythical evaporation; and the course of Evolution is traced from the condition of the liberated Egyptian serfs, in their ignorance and debasement, morally and socially, through the subsequent stages of their national life, until it cul-

minates in the institutions of Christianity. The recipients of the books of Moses, were in the stage of spiritual and moral childhood, that of mere ceremonialism, sacrifices, lustrations. As in process of time men of genius, and commanding talent arose, as leaders and teachers, there was the higher evolution of prophecy. Men Divinely moved, that is moved in and through the exercise of power Divinely transmitted through the preceding stages of natural evolutionary process, were enabled to see and speak to the exigencies of their times, and thus gradually, to bring up the whole people to their own higher level of intelligence and spiritual capacity. This was heightened, still further, by the moral chastening and training of the captivity, by the contact of Babylonian, Persian and Grecian thought, and eventually found its highest point in the life and teaching of the Founder of Christianity. It is all purely natural. It was involved in the Solar ray, or in the elemental life germ; and it has been evolved through the operation of natural forces, and by purely natural agencies. GOD, it may be, was in the elemental life power, in the Solar ray, or in the orb from which it emanated. But all subsequent, whether forces, operations, or results are only nature. All these, in their multifariousness of kind, as of operation and manifestation, find their adequate solution in these two words, natural evolution.

Now, without just here stopping to insist that Evolution is a process or method, not a force, a mode not a power, and thus fails as a final explanation of anything in the shape of continued movement;* without again denying that, in the possibilities of infinitude, such evolutionary process might have been started, and kept a going; and confining our views simply to the contents of the Old Testament history, we find the theory described encountered by numberless and hopeless difficulties. There is, first, the overwhelming difficulty, that under this supposition, a purely natural process, going on

*"Although," says the Father of Inductive science, "we govern our words, and prescribe it well: *Loquendum ut vulgus, sentiendum ut sapientes*, yet certain it is, that words, as a Tartar's bow, do shoot back upon the understanding of the wisest, and mightily entangle and pervert the judgment."

through centuries, so went on, that its character, and agencies, and results, were all along misunderstood and misconstrued; that the writers, from whom we get all our information, as also the men who were the agents to the recorded results, all along, misunderstood their position and work, and were misunderstood by others; that regarding and proclaiming themselves as supernaturally endowed, and so accepted by others, they were only the media of the evolution of forces purely natural. So again, all through the different ages, and in each of them, there are truths and principles which, upon the evolution theory, are above that age, elements indicating to the men of any such age a previous higher and better condition: thus pointing to a previous condition of elevation to which restoration might be sought, as point of departure to one of a still higher character, in the future, for which they are in process of Divine preparation. In other words, according to Old Testament declaration, while there has been a supernatural evolution upward and progressive, there has been a natural or unnatural one downward and retrogressive. Man in personal communion with God and with a possible eternal life is on the opening pages of Old Testament history. The two sons of the first man are not savages nor hunters; but one of them is a shepherd, and the other a cultivator of the soil. Integrity of life, and translation without death is the brief biography of one of the Antediluvian patriarchs. Fidelity to God, amid surrounding apostacy, is the record in regard to another, and faith in God in its most marvellous exercise is exhibited by another. The law of love is enunciated by Moses. The excellencies of CHRIST, and many of the truths and principles of His ethical teaching, are to be found in the Psalms and prophecies. All this is inconsistent with the hypothesis of natural evolution. It does not provide for, or explain the larger portion of the facts. Those facts are out of place and time, some of them much later, others much earlier, than where on that theory they properly belong. No account is taken of interferences, from above and from beneath, by which so largely the current of events is controlled.

This theory has only one class of spiritual factors to earthly resorts, whereas the Old Testament has three. In the one case the presence and power of man explains everything; in the other, it is not only man, but GOD, and other spiritual beings good and evil.

Difficulties of this kind could not fail to be recognized, especially the dislocations of sentiments and principles, which so often, upon this theory of mere natural progress, come out before their time. Effort, therefore, has been made to remove them; but that effort creates greater difficulties, of a historical and critical character, than any which it attempts to remove. Its mode of operation is that of critical reconstruction; reconstruction of the material, and rearrangement of the books of the Old Testament. Much of this by an earlier effort, that of the anti-supernatural critical school, had already been essayed; as, for instance, Isaiah has spoken of Cyrus, by name, and described the particulars of the destruction of Babylon, so, inspiration and inspired prediction being impossible, the Great Unnamed, or one of the Great Unnamed, had, after the events, written that part of the book, tacked it on, or it had got tacked on, somehow or another to the genuine Isaiah, and forthwith, and forever after, until the rise of the critical school, it has been accepted as his, without hesitation or question. So again, as Daniel had delineated events, of the times of Antiochus Epiphanes, his book, or that part of it which prophetically delineates the events of that period, must have been composed after their occurrence. The books of Moses contain various directions and warnings as to events and conditions, which prevailed during the ages of the Judges and the Kings; and must therefore, have been suggested by these, as in actual or past existence. The trouble, however, with their reconstructions, was that each writer had his own, and a different plan from all the others, generally succeeded in proving that all the others were of no value; but, whether so or not, suggesting the very natural conclusion, that when such a Babel of results followed the application of a certain method, that method must be worthless.

Now, it is the application of this same method, of anti-

supernatural criticism, which has found its resurrection, and moulding agency in this charmed Word, and its mysterious powers and processes, Evolution. Here at least, it is intimated, we have the key, opening to us, in all its parts of this old record, the purely natural explanation. Genesis, as the region of myth and allegory, is not disturbed. Deuteronomy with its law of love, its grand enunciations of the principles of the Divine administration, and its exhibitions of the effects of national fidelity or infidelity, is put over into the age of Josiah or that of Ezra. The prophecies referring to CHRIST, only had reference to contemporaneous princes and deliverers. The utterances and principles of the Master Himself, as their results in the Christianity of the past and the present, are introductory to the higher moral and spiritual elements of the religion of the future. This final result, as the evolutionary process through which it is reached, is purely natural.

Why, it may be asked, any final? Perhaps, because we are so constituted that the mind cannot rest in the prospect of an endless series of natural evolutions. So far as we can get a conception of this finality, from the more advanced, it is to involve, negatively, the passing away of all the old notions of Heaven and Hell, and GOD as a Personal Being, and a future world of men as personal beings; to consist, positively, in the highest physical, intellectual, and social welfare of each generation, as it comes and continues upon the stage of earthly existence; and, through this, into the sphere of the unknown and the unknowable. As moreover all is contained in the body, and cremation will be universal, so will pass away all the gloomy associations of the grave, all superstitious dreams of a resurrection. Beyond that consummating reabsorption of all that is real in man, into "the fiery cloud," of primitive origination, in which is "contained all potencies," is Nirvana! The evolutionary process is perfected. In getting rid of the supernatural, we have gotten rid of ourselves; we have gotten rid of GOD in any intelligible or rational sense of the word.

But, is there not, it may be asked, some truth or truths

at which these theories are sometimes grasping, or of which they are exaggerations or caricatures? Is there not a progress brought to view in the Scriptures themselves of the Old and New Testaments of which this word Evolution may be used as descriptive? Undoubtedly there is in one of its many significations, such an evolution, of which, by the inspired writers, we are frequently reminded. Throughout, from Genesis to Revelation, there are frequent and clear indications, and there is the constant implication, of a Divine purpose and plan, gradually accomplished, gradually evolving itself, and revealed as men in such evolution, were able to understand and to receive it; an evolution, in its progress going on beyond this world, perfected in "a new heaven and a new earth, wherein dwell righteousness." But the revelation of this, the divinely spoken announcement of this, is a supernatural one. Included in such evolution, moreover, and demanded to its actualization, are supernatural forces, agencies Divine and angelic, as well as human, specific interpositions, from a sphere above that of the natural, by which it is accomplished, and by which that accomplishment is authenticated. "The wisdom of GOD in a mystery," the wise plan of GOD "hidden from previous ages and generations," to use the striking expression of S. Paul, is brought to view in the Gospel. Such an evolution, or rather progressive revolution, as this, the Church has always recognized, devoutly studied, and endeavored to understand. While it finds a golden age of the past, in the untried innocence of Eden, it looks forward, in reliance upon supernatural promise, to the golden ages of ages future, in the tested Heavenly excellence of the redeemed and glorified. And, all through the ages intervening, is gratefully recognized the divinely arranged and conducted process of preparation, the evolution of the Divine plans and purposes, to the divinely anticipated conclusion. But, as already intimated, there are certain peculiarities in this evolution, which render it unique, and without parallel,—baffling all efforts, alike to bring it within the scope of natural forces, or to classify it with natural evolutions. It contains all the forces of these, and

uses many of their processes. But, over and above, it has a higher force, a different law of progress, and a conclusion transcendent. This higher force consists of specifically revealed truths and interpositions, from the beginning and all along, as they are demanded by human need and seen fit by Divine wisdom. In these are contained and exhibited fuller manifestations of the Divine will and character, of man's spiritual capacities and relations and duties, of His heavenly destiny, and of the Divine provision to its attainment. All this, moreover goes on, in spite of, and contravenient to tendencies in human nature, and satanic temptations to human nature to an evolution of an opposing and downward character.

Nor is it merely in one line of Divine operation, that such evolutionary progress is exhibited. It is everywhere present, and under whatever aspect the Scriptures may be contemplated. Take, for instance, the Old Testament. Whether that Old Testament be contemplated historically, ethically, or prophetically, this fact of upward and enlarging advance is constantly presented. Historically, men are so dealt with, and the perfections of the Divine character so revealed in that dealing, that, as the history goes on, this Divine character is more fully understood, and the human character of the recipients seen to be elevated. It is from the lower to the higher, from the more to the less imperfect, from the narrower to the broader and more expansive. So again as to what may be called the law of ethical progress during the same period. Whatever the material of this in Patriarchal times, a portion of it, and that which Scripturally constitutes the point of starting in the ethical progress of the race is the result of Divine impartation. This too, whether little or much, doubtless included the elements of Divine supremacy, justice and goodness, and of human dependence, rendering possible the formation of such characters as those of Enoch, Noah, and Abraham,—to be enlarged, and advanced in the additional, and more specific revelations of Sinai, and the wilderness. The substance of this, again in turn, as appropriated and wrought into the convictions and life of the better element of the chosen peo-

ple, prepared them, in the mass, to receive, as it did their divinely selected and inspired prophets to impart, additionally, of new truths, and newly manifested inferences from old truths, as material, of new moral, and spiritual life, to further national advancement.

And this feature, thus historically and ethically manifested, may be no less clearly seen, regarding the Old Testament as a record of prophecy. Just as Mosaicism, historically and ethically, was an evolution, by supernatural as well as by natural forces, out of Patriarchalism, so is prophecy, and by the same two forces, out of Mosaicism; and this by predictive word as well as by the gradual explanation of type and symbol. Most clearly is such advance feature exhibited in prophecy, and from the beginning, in that portion of it which is occupied with the coming Deliverer and His Deliverance,—of Him who is alike the hope of Israel and of the world. This great hope of Deliverance is supernaturally communicated at the fall. It was supernaturally heightened, and increased, and rendered more full, and definite in the impartation of additional truths in subsequent periods. And men were supernaturally enlightened to proclaim and to accept its full realization. It was the wisdom of GOD hidden from ages and generations,—through these ages and generations, gradually unfolding itself to man's capacity of reception,—fully revealed in CHRIST, the time having come for its complete and perfected manifestation.

Passing over other portions of Old Testament material, exhibitiv of Divinely provided forces and Divinely arranged processes to a Divinely foreseen and appointed result; and that in this there is the feature of advance from the less to the greater, from the lower to the higher, with the peculiarities already exhibited; and without stopping to show, what has been so well done by others,* that, also, in the New Testament, the same evolutionary process, with the same forces, the same controlling agency, and the same peculiarity of movement, to a Divinely arranged result, are to be recognized, we encounter a question of

* See Bernard's Bampton Lectures on Progress of Doctrine in New Testament, Von Osterzee's Theology of New Testament, and Professor Rainey's Theory on New Testament Development.

a kindred character, and, just now, demanding adjustment: that of the nature of the evolution, which goes on subsequent to the withdrawal of the supernatural agencies involved in specific inspired revelation, in other words post-New Testament evolution. In raising this question, our contention is still, although under another form, against the same assumption of naturalism with which all along we have been occupied. Reasoning from the uniformities of the present, naturalism says: "All things continue as they were," all forces operate as they have been operating, from the beginning of evolution. There have never been any others. Revelation, inspiration, prophecy, miracle, have no place in nature. What seems to be these, and is called by their names, is all natural. As, moreover, all these natural phenomena and forces of the past, are in the present and future, so the evolution goes on. Revelation of the Divine was not closed with the closing books of New Testament. Here, also, in certain respects, Papalism and Ecclesiasticism stand upon common ground with Naturalism. In common, they all assert, the continued evolution of Divine truth, supplementary to Scriptural revelation. The common result, in each alike, is to bring the inspired dictates to the level of those that are human,—in the one case, to that of the human utterance of natural capacity, in the other to that of the corporate Church, or of its visible Head. We thus have the three theories of Naturalistic, Ecclesiastical, and Papal Evolutionism. The first says: It is all natural now; it has been ever so. The second and third say: It was supernatural in the past; it is, and will be so in Ecclesiastical and Papal evolution of Divine truth in the present and the future.

Nor is this all pure error and falsehood. It has been, and is, in many cases, a groping, in the dark, after truth, a truth of great practical importance; that of the real evolution of inspired truth, as of its moral and spiritual effects to be looked for, and to be actualized in all the ages of the uninspired Church. To go back to the spiritual evolution of the ancient people of God, say from Moses to Samuel, or from Malachi to John the Baptist, there was manifestly advance and upward movement.

This was of a twofold character. First, subjectively, in their clearer and fuller appreciation, as it was wrought into practice, or providentially illuminated, of the meaning of the truths previously revealed; secondly, in their recognition of the manifold new, and hitherto unexpected applications, of which that truth was susceptible. So is it in the evolution of the uninspired Christian Church of the past, and the present. To use a thought of Professor Rainey, there is an evolution, beyond the merely natural, not what is usually called the supernatural, we may call it gracious, including the intellectual, moral, and spiritual, up to an appreciation of the full contents and measure of authoritative inspired and infallible truth, contained in the New Testament. To such result, every effort of sanctified intellect, and often, in the overrulings of Divine agency, even of unsanctified and infidel scholarship is an approximation. And, *pari passu*, where there is a normal condition of Church and individual life, under the gracious agency of the Divine Spirit, alike, the Enlightener and Sanctifier, there is another evolution, not *up to*, but *out from*, this same New Testament truth, in its manifold inferences and applications; in the recognition of the universal sweep of its principles to all the movements and all the moments of individual and collective man; and, then, in the personal appropriation and reduction of them to practice. When Christendom thus develops *up to* the full measure and meaning of the inspired truth of the Old and New Testament, when it thus develops *out from* that truth to its full inferences and applications, in other words, when it perfectly *knows* and perfectly *does* all this truth of inspired revelation, Christian and human evolution will be perfected. The earthly Jerusalem, prepared for its reception, will be ready to welcome the New Jerusalem coming down, out of heaven, from GOD.

C. WALKER.

BAPTISM FOR THE DEAD—ITS BEARING UPON THE RESURRECTION.

MANY clergymen and most laymen, on reading the Burial Lesson, are perplexed at the passage which relates to Baptism for the Dead,—“Else what shall they do which are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? Why are they then baptized for the dead?”* What, say they to themselves, is this Baptism for the dead? Was it an apostolic rite? Has the Church abolished or retained it? And in either case, what has it to do with the consoling truth of this lesson,—the Again-rising of the dead?

Exegetes meanwhile have been busy enough with the passage. Indeed, hermeneutical ingenuity which could produce over fifty interpretations of Gal. 3. 20—“Now a mediator is not a mediator of one; but God is One”—has found this passage a field hardly less fertile. Most explanations, however, do violence either to the language of the text, or else to the head or the heart of the great Apostle.

In the present article I propose to examine briefly, first, the syntax of the passage; secondly, its place in the argument; and, thirdly, the leading interpretations, with reasons for and against the same.

The first word (*επει*) is rightly translated “else,” and not, as some would have it, in its usual signification of *since*, in explicit reference to, or causal connection with, the clause immediately preceding. The fact is, S. Paul after arguing on several grounds, for the resurrection of the

* *Ἐπεὶ τί ποιήσουσιν οἱ βαπτιζόμενοι ὑπὲρ ἰῶν νεκρῶν; εἰ ὅλως νεκροὶ οὐκ ἐγείρονται, τί καὶ βαπτίζονται ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν; 1. Cor. 15, 29*

dead, indulges in a digression, beginning with verse 20, as borne on by the current of inspiration and the association of ideas, he sees the Second Coming of CHRIST, the completed Resurrection, and GOD reigning "all in all." Returning to his argument he in effect exclaims: "The dead shall surely rise, or *else*, if they do not rise, the practice of baptizing for the dead is meaningless and absurd."

The question "What shall they do?" seems to mean How shall they act? how, if there be no resurrection, shall they vindicate themselves from the charge of absurdity, who have submitted to a rite which postulates the Again-rising?

As to the participial clause, *hoi baptizomenoi*, some commentators, among them Conybeare and Howson, translate it as a middle form, not, of course, *who baptize themselves*,—like the Puritan Se-Baptist of Holland,—but, with the secondary force of the middle, *who cause themselves to be baptized*. So Luther: *Die Sich Taufen lassen*. It seems, however, much simpler and more in accord with the nature of a sacramental act to render the word, as an ordinary passive, they "who are baptized for the dead," *i.e.*, the multitudes who in Corinth or elsewhere are admitted to this rite, the tense being a present of habitude implying a custom widespread.

The preposition *huper*, with the genitive, may in *classic* Greek refer to locality, like its cognates *super* in Latin, and *above* and *over* in English, but is never so used in the New Testament. Here it may mean, for, in behalf of, instead of, in the name of, in defense of, on account of, or *with reference to*. This last meaning is peculiarly comprehensive. It is the Latin *de* tinged with the force of *pro*, and is best expressed by one of the many shades of our ambiguous and much-enduring preposition *for*.

The article appears to be the collective or generic article. The dead, *i.e.*, the whole body of the departed, probably in a Christian sense, equivalent to the liturgical phrase, "The faithful departed." This will be noticed again in examining one of the interpretations.

The remaining words call for no critical investigation.

Admissible differences of punctuation, in no way alter the sense.

II. Before discussing the nature of Baptism for the Dead, it will be well to notice the place of this verse in S. Paul's argument for the Resurrection.

Reasoning is nothing but classification. It consists merely in placing an unknown fact or disputed proposition under one or more known facts or admitted propositions.

"Of GOD above or man below
What can we reason, but from what we know?"

In Corinth, as in some other parts of the Church, heretics, like Hymeneus and Philetus,* had called in question the resurrection of the dead.

S. Paul labors to show that the doctrine of our resurrection is comprehended under or necessitated by certain incontrovertible truths and practices. Such for instance as the Resurrection of JESUS CHRIST, which is the keystone of the Faith, and the custom of Baptizing for the dead, whatever that may be. The argument is:—CHRIST is preached to you as *risen from the dead*, which shows that resurrection is possible. Accordingly, if you deny the possibility of resurrection, you must deny CHRIST'S Resurrection. But this denial is followed by a train of consequences so appalling as must make one recoil in horror from a premise which necessitates it. If this heresy which denies the Resurrection be true, if there be indeed no resurrection of the dead, then CHRIST did not rise; and if CHRIST did not rise, then we who say we were eye-witnesses of His Resurrection are false-witnesses and impostors, preaching a lie; and if so, your faith is vain, ye are yet in your sins; and of course also those who are fallen asleep in CHRIST—and this was a tender point with the early Christians, who loved their departed ones, and prayed that they might "rest in peace"—are perished, and we Christians are of all men the most miserable.

No wonder that S. Paul, unable even for the sake of

* 2 Tim. ii. 17-18.

argument to endure the supposition, bursts forth in a rhetorical strain of didactic inspiration, of dogmatism authoritative and sublime: "But now is CHRIST risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept."

Descending from this Mount of Transfiguration he proceeds to exorcise the demon of heresy by an additional argument drawn from a certain ecclesiastical rite.

Baptism for the dead postulates immortality, you accept Baptism for the dead, therefore you must believe in the future life.

And here be it observed that to S. Paul's mind the only immortality possible to man is the immortality of his *whole nature*—body, soul and spirit, implying thus, the "Resurrection of the Flesh." He did not, like some of our sentimental eschatologists, "want to be an angel;" he desired "not to be unclothed, but clothed upon." This principle underlies all the theology of S. Paul.*

Expanded accordingly the syllogism would read:

Baptism for the dead postulates man's immortality AS MAN, *body and soul, i.e.*, postulates the RESURRECTION; Baptism for the dead is an authorized universal practice of the Church; † *Ergo*, the Resurrection of the dead is an *authoritative Catholic dogma*.

* It also throws light on many otherwise unintelligible passages of the Inspired Word. It is not long since the writer of this article heard a clergyman remark that he considered *Resurrection* and *Immortality* equivalent and convertible terms, alleging in proof the words of our Blessed LORD: "As touching the Resurrection, have ye not read that which is spoken unto you by GOD, saying, 'I am the GOD of Abraham,' etc.? GOD is not the GOD of the dead, but of the living." S. Matthew xxiii. 31-2. If, however, we will bear in mind that our SAVIOUR addressed this argument to the Sadducees, whose ground for denying the Resurrection was that, as materialists, they denied also *immortality*, saying, 'That there is [not only] no Resurrection [but as the ground of that denial], neither Angel nor Spirit' (Acts xxii. 8), then we shall see its force. The first step in proving to such the Resurrection of the dead is to prove that the *dead* are still living, that death does not end all—this proved, the *possibility* of the Resurrection is established.

So too, GOD tells us, with reference to the Blessed and Life-giving Sacrament of the Altar: 'Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood (1) *hath eternal life*, and (2) *I will raise him up at the last day*' (S. John vi. 54). Here we see that eternal life and the Resurrection are two *distinct* gifts—the former being the logical and essential antecedent of the latter.

The question of 'Conditional Resurrection' suggests itself here. It has certainly more to commend it than the notion of 'Conditional Immortality'—which of late some distinguished clergymen have made *far more prominent than it deserves to be*. It may, perhaps, be admissible to say that the Resurrection *par excellence*, the only resurrection worthy the name, is the resurrection of those 'in CHRIST' (1 Cor. xv. 22 and 23), 'the Resurrection of Life,' while there still remains for the finally impenitent, the final doom (whatever that may be) which Incarnate GOD has called 'the Resurrection of Damnation' (S. John v. 29.)

† In stating this minor premise, I anticipate the interpretation of this passage which is offered below.

S. Paul had already shown that a denial of the Resurrection is an insult, first, to CHRIST Himself; secondly, to the Apostles; thirdly, to all believers; fourthly, to the faithful departed; and now in the verse under discussion he shows that it is an affront to all—whoever they may be—who are “baptized for the dead;” it stultifies their action which presupposes the Resurrection.

III. We come now to consider the meaning of the words *baptized for the dead*. Are they figurative, or not? Is reference here made to some local and temporary rite, to Clinical Baptism alone, or to the ordinary Sacrament of Regeneration as always and everywhere administered in the Catholic Church?

(a) The first theory to be noted is that which takes the words in a *figurative* sense. It is the theory of Lightfoot, Rosenmüller, Robinson and others—the favorite theory of those Zwinglian interpreters, both within and without the Church, who are wont to interpolate a negative into all the positive Sacramental declarations of Holy Writ, who would have us believe that GOD’S own categorical affirmation: THIS IS MY BODY, was but a “Gospel” euphemism for “This is NOT My body;” and that S. Peter’s assertion, “Baptism * doth also now save us,” means “Baptism is not a *Saving Ordinance*.” Howbeit, let the interpretation stand on its own merits, or rather, if so be, fall from its own demerits. Baptized for the dead must then mean, according to Robinson, “immersed in sufferings.” If the dead rise not at all, why are Christians baptized in sufferings for the dead?

Let it suffice to say that this interpretation makes the passage exactly equivalent to what follows: “Why stand we in jeopardy every hour?” that it trifles with a sacramental term, giving it a very unnatural meaning; and that it requires a harsh and difficult ellipsis.

(b) The theory of Luther and Vossius, that reference is here made to a custom of baptizing over the graves of the dead, “*über den Todten*,” as the German Testament has it, must be rejected because, as stated above, the preposition *huper* is never so used in Hellenistic Greek,

* 1 Pet. iii. 21.

and moreover there is not the slightest evidence of any such practice in Apostolic times.

(c) Others explain it in this way: Why are people baptized, when the act is equivalent to putting their names on a death-roll of martyrs, unless there be the hope of resurrection? In opposition to this view it may be said, the language employed is not susceptible of this rendering which would call for a different phrase; nor is there any evidence of martyrdoms, in Corinth, so early in the history of the Church.

(d) The theory of Clinical Baptism, as a Sacrament administered to the dying for the sake of the faithful departed among whom they are to be associated in Paradise, has much to commend it. What clergyman when called to read the Burial Service over one whom he has just christened *in extremis*, does not say to himself, "I baptized him for the dead, I admitted him not so much to the Church on earth as to the Church above." But is not this really true of all baptism? Private baptism and public baptism are the same baptism. "I believe in *one* baptism for the remission of sins."

This theory then seems to make a distinction between the nature of ordinary baptism and of baptism *in extremis*. They are alike *for the dead*, the one as much as the other, only in the latter case the abode of the dead is a trifle nearer at hand,—and what are a few days or years in comparison with eternity? It may well be, however, that Clinical Baptism, which is of course included under the general head of baptism, is specially referred to, as will be mentioned below.

There are many other interpretations, such as being baptized (e), For the sake of the dead, so as to complete the number of the elect and thus enable the dead to rise; or (f), That of being christened out of respect for and administration of dead saints; or (g), In the place of departed saints, so as to fill up the ranks of the Church Militant thinned by death. Of these, however, *no one alone* seems to be adequate. Whatever element of truth any one of them may contain is included in the broader

and more catholic explanation, which it is the object of this article to defend.

Setting aside, then, all these hypotheses, let us examine the two most important interpretations.

(h) The theory of Vicarious Baptism or Christening by proxy, *i. e.*, that when a person died unbaptized, some friend of the deceased allowed himself to be baptized in his stead, in his behalf, seems at first sight to be the most natural interpretation. It takes *huper* in its most obvious sense; and such baptism for the dead would certainly require a belief in the Resurrection. This is the interpretation commonly received.

As to its meeting the linguistic requirements, however, we must remember that it were better to charge an Apostle with a likely solecism, than to make him speak that which is irrational or untrue. Take for example S. John viii. 44. The most literal and natural rendering would be: "The devil is a liar *and so is his father*"!—which is absurd. Consequently we translate it less grammatically but as common sense demands: "The devil is a liar and the father of it."

Yet, is this interpretation, this proxy theory, after all the most grammatical? I think not. True, it renders the preposition in its most common though by no means its only legitimate sense; but it ignores or perverts the article *ton* before *nekron*.. These proxies, if any such there were, could not be said to be baptized for THE dead, the dead collectively, but *huper nekron, i. e.*, for *dead persons individually*. *The dead* means the whole body of the departed, or, in a catholic sense, the whole body of the faithful departed. We see the force of the article in the 35th verse: "How are the dead raised?" *hamethim* of the Old Testament. Observe, therefore, if reference were here made to dead individuals for whom proxies had been baptized, the article would have been omitted.*

But even waving this point, I submit that vicarious baptism was never practiced in the Catholic Church. A Protestant sect in Utah, "The Church of the Latter Day Saints," thus interpreting this passage, practices proxy

* See Winer § 19, p. 112.

baptism for certain who die unbaptized; but in the Church, ancient and modern, no traces of this absurd and pernicious rite are to be found. As the Bishop of Lincoln observes, "Some heretics, indeed, *misinterpreting this present passage of S. Paul*, grounded such a practice upon it so misunderstood: the practice was posterior to the words of S. Paul. The words were not produced by the practice". Or, as Conybeare and Howson say, "The practice was never adopted except by some obscure sects of Gnostics, who seem to have founded their custom on this very passage."

Who these early heretics were we learn from Tertullian, S. Chrysostom, and S. Epiphanius. They were the Marcionites and the Corinthians. S. Chrysostom, in a sermon on this very chapter,* says that, when one of the Marcionite Catechumens died, "a living person was placed under the dead man's bed, and asked whether he desired to be baptized. The living man on answering affirmatively was forthwith baptized in place of the deceased." These are the only cases known of vicarious baptism.

But it will be urged, may not such a practice have existed temporarily in the Corinthian Church, and may not S. Paul have availed himself of it for an *argumentum ad hominem*?

Let us see. Is it reasonable to suppose that a practice so intrinsically superstitious, and so widely at variance with catholic teaching upon the nature of sacraments, and upon the state of the departed, could have become so thoroughly established in an Apostolic Church, as to be made the ground of an inspired argument for the Resurrection of the dead? It must, remember, have been more strongly believed than the Resurrection itself, otherwise S. Paul could not have appealed to it as a proof of the latter. That would be a strange syllogism whose premises, forsooth, were more doubtful than the conclusion. It would be as if one were to ground the duty of obedience to the laws of the United States, which all citizens measurably allow, upon the divine right of kings, which none

* Hom. XI. See also Tertul. *De Res. Car.* 48.

of them believe. Moreover, is it conceivable that, along with a growing skepticism touching the future life, there should have arisen a practice which most strenuously proclaimed the Resurrection of the dead? The womb of Corinthian thought could hardly have given birth to twin monsters so dissimilar and mutually opposed.

Again, we must remember, superstitions relative to holy baptism were of later growth and of gradual development. Is it likely, then, that the most outrageous baptismal heresy known to history—one which implies the impossible analogy of *vicarious birth*, which makes the sacrament a magic spell operating on a sinner whose soul is in Hades and whose corpse on earth, which presupposes the existence of heresies which were of later growth, such as post-mortal probation, and the "Romish doctrine concerning Purgatory", a custom more pestilential and inane than the traffic in requiems, or the praying for the *lost*,—should have been the very first to arise?

But even if this were the case, if such a distortion of the foundation-sacrament of Christianity were so prevalent in Corinth as to be more fully received than the doctrine of the Resurrection, surely S. Paul would never have made use of it, even as an *argumentum ad hominem*, in his inspired pleading for the Resurrection, in his solemn arraignment of a heresy which shipwrecked the Faith, which blasphemed the Risen LORD, which gave the lie to His blessed Apostles, which robbed the living of their hope, and dishonored the memory of the dead. In other words, it is impossible that, in combatting so dire an impiety, S. Paul should have stooped to shelter himself under a gross superstition which, if it existed at all (which is more than doubtful) existed only to be so overwhelmed, and that too by apostolic authority, that the custom was never again heard of in the Church? As well might a parent place a child in a burning building in order, forsooth, to save him from the devouring flames. As well might holy Archbishop Laud have argued for the royal supremacy from the shocking custom, which he himself reformed, of stopping the worship of Almighty God as

soon as the king entered a church, that the sermon might begin at once!

Viewed in all its bearings this interpretation, now most generally received, is certainly one of the least satisfactory. A little mist gives place to a fog and a storm. One difficulty is driven out only to return with seven greater to the swept and garnished text.

To sum up, this interpretation ignores the article *ton*; it *assumes* the practice of vicarious baptism in the Church of Corinth without the slightest evidence in its favor, and in the face of vast improbabilities, nay, of moral impossibilities; and, in a case involving the life or death of Christianity, it degrades the logic of S. Paul to an unscrupulous *ad hominem*, or the *ad captandum* of the Courts.

The assertion of Bisping and Dean Alford that the use of the third person ("what shall *they* do?" "why are *they* baptized?") implies disapproval, was not apparent to the Greek Fathers, and is not to most Greek scholars. Does the use of the third person in verse twenty-third ("*They* that are *His* at *His* coming") imply a tacit disapproval of CHRIST Himself and of the Resurrection of the Just? But even if it were an implied reprehension of the practice, it would only weaken still more the force of the argument which would then amount simply to this:

You have a superstitious custom which I am going to abolish;

This superstitious custom presupposes the Resurrection of the dead;

Ergo: The dead shall rise (!)

From these conjectures let us now turn to the latest explanation which, like so many other good things, is substantially patristic—viz: That, as the term resurrection of the dead means only resurrection, so the phrase baptism for the dead is nothing but a full, orthodox, and, in this connection, peculiarly apt and forcible designation of the ordinary sacrament of regeneration.

If the dead rise not, what shall they do, how shall they vindicate their consistency, who are baptized, *baptized for the dead*?—they who, throughout the world, profess-

ing their belief in the resurrection of the dead, are being christened in the name of, in behalf of, on account of the faithful departed. First in the name of CHRIST the risen LORD into whose death they are baptized; then on account of, with reference to, *for* all the elect in Paradise, who "without us cannot be made perfect", into whose communion, the fellowship of the saints in light, we are admitted by this baptism; and why especially, unless the dead are to rise again, should a *dying* person be baptized, who is, of course, baptized not at all for the sake of the Church on earth, but of the Church above?

This explanation satisfies the linguistic requirements of the text; it takes *hoi baptizomenoi* in its literal and natural sense, it observes the article *ton*, giving to *ton nekron* its usual and technical signification, it does no violence to the preposition,—indeed *hyper*, with its manifold and comprehensive shades of meaning, is just the word for the place. And last but not least, this interpretation spares the honest logic of S. Paul, sheltering the truth of the Resurrection, which was called in question, under the universal Sacrament of the New Birth, a type of the Resurrection, which Satan had not then—as indeed he has not *yet*—successfully assailed within the Church.

There remains one consideration needed to substantiate this view, a consideration crucial and supreme. Does this view harmonize with the Scriptural, Apostolic, Catholic doctrine of Holy Baptism? In other words, has baptism, as here assumed, promise of the life which is to come? Does it really postulate the Resurrection? Is it in any true sense *for the dead*?

There are, it must be confessed, among modern Protestants, diverse theories which rob this sacrament of all meaning, efficacy, and grace even for this life, much more for the future. If baptism be but an empty ordinance, an indifferent rite, a pretty symbol, a touching ceremony; nay, if be even the necessary form of initiation into the Church as a society on earth, without being a great deal more, any rational man would be puzzled to use it or to receive it as a serious argument for the Resurrection of the dead. S. Paul's reasoning would have

fallen very flat upon the average of American Protestants. even of those who condescend to retain baptism at all. Many Dissenters are christened who, having rejected the baptismal creed of the Apostles, make no profession of faith in the Resurrection—not a few of them, indeed, positively denying it—and who would, therefore, be astonished if told that baptism is a standing and inspired proof of true human immortality, that is to say, of the “Resurrection of the flesh.”

If, on the other hand, we simply accept baptism as CHRIST and His Apostles preached it, as the Catholic Church has always retained it, and as it is most sacredly and conspicuously set forth in the doctrinal and liturgical standards of the American Church, then the force and harmony of the reasoning appear.

Such baptism is for the dead. It is a sacrament administered only on profession of belief in the resurrection of the dead—first, the Resurrection of Incarnate GOD, secondly, the general Resurrection, the Again-rising of the flesh. It typifies not only our dying with CHRIST, but our rising together with Him.* It has promise of the life which is to come, because it is *generaliter* necessary to salvation, a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness,** a new creation,† “the first Resurrection,”†† a Regeneration of Water and the HOLY GHOST,§ a calling into a state of salvation,** an act which *saves* coördinately with repentance,‡ faith,§§ and good works, which saves as truly as the Ark saved Noah, but which saves “by the Resurrection of JESUS CHRIST,”*** the revealed way of making sons of GOD, children of grace, members of CHRIST and inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven;** a sure witness and an effectual sign of grace whereby GOD doth work invisibly in us,|| the instrument and seal of engrafting into the Church ¶ (which is an eternal kingdom embracing the *dead* as well as the living), the instrument and seal of the promise of forgiveness

* Rom. vi. 3 et seq. and Col. ii. 12.

** Ch. Catechism.

†† Rev. xx. 5 and 6.

† See II. Cor. v. 17, in con. with the Scripture phrase “Baptized into CHRIST.”

§§ S. Mark xvi. 16.

*** 1. Peter iii. 21.

‡ Acts ii. 38.

§ See S. John iii. 5, and first Prayer in Order of Conf.

|| Art. XXV.

¶ Art. XXVII.

and of adoption to be the sons of GOD by the HOLY GHOST,* the everlasting benediction of GOD's Heavenly washing.†

In short the New Testament identifies or associates baptism with salvation at least ten times, and the Prayer Book on this point as in general reflects the light of revealed truth.‡ The benefits of baptism have reference to the future life, are *nil* without it. Baptism has, therefore, a supernal and unique relation to the faithful departed. It with its accompanying professions is a perpetual defense of the dead. The waters for the Laver of Regeneration are drawn not from earth nor from the wells of time, but from the "Jasper Sea," from the perennial fountains of Heaven; and "unto the place whence they come, thither do they return again."

The interpretation here offered comports, therefore, with the Catholic doctrine of Holy Baptism which always points beyond the tomb. Moreover it is quite possible that this phase of the sacrament may have been specially emphasized in Corinth in connection with the deaths which had accompanied the then recent epidemic which GOD appears to have sent upon the Corinthian Christians for their unworthy treatment of the Holy Eucharist.

In conclusion, and as a corollary, the fact that the Church's doctrine of Holy Baptism so satisfies the question, so meets the requirements of the inspired argument, is an additional proof, if any be needed, of the far-reaching and beneficent power of the New Birth.

Yes, the baptism of the living has reference to the dead, is FOR them, proclaims the Resurrection. The River of Life which flows through earth for the mystical washing away of sin is indeed "a river the streams whereof make glad the City of GOD, the holy place of the tabernacles of the Most High."

ARTHUR WILDE LITTLE.

*Bap. Office.

†See "The Bible compared with the Liturgy," by the Rev. H. I. Bailey (S. P. C. K.).

‡ "Apologia *pro mortuis*."

CAN CONSCIENCE BE EDUCATED?

WHAT is meant by Conscience? is manifestly the first step in the discussion. Probably there is no word in the language that has been used with such various meanings, and certainly there is none in regard to which there is greater need for philosophic exactness. It depends altogether upon what we make conscience to be, whether we render an affirmative or negative answer to the question, "Can conscience be educated?" If we define it, with Mackintosh, to be "a combination of our moral sentiments or feelings, which have no other object but the mental dispositions leading to voluntary action";* or with Schopenhauer, to be, "one-fifth, fear of man; one-fifth, superstition; one-fifth, prejudice; one-fifth, vanity; one-fifth, custom";† then we must admit, with Dr. Whewell, that "we must labor to enlighten and instruct our conscience."‡ But if we define conscience, with Bishop Butler, to be that "faculty, in kind and in nature, supreme over all others, and which bears its own authority of being so,"§ or with Prof. Calderwood, to be "that power of mind by which moral law is discovered to each individual for the guidance of his conduct * * * the reason, as that discovers to us absolute moral truth, having the authority of sovereign moral law," || then we must hold, with Prof. Bowen, "the absolute certainty of

* Dissert. *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Whewell's edit., p. 323.

† *Die beiden Grundprobleme der Ethik*, p. 196, 2d edit, Leipzig, 1860; quoted by Prof. Calderwood, *Handbook of Moral Philosophy*, p. 140, eighth edit. London, 1881.

‡ *Elements of Morality*, bk. III. ch. xiv., p. 262. Harpers, 1857.

§ *Sermons on Human Nature*, II. Sermon, p. 24. London, 1862.

|| *Handbook of Moral Philosophy*, p. 77, eighth edit. London, 1881.

its decisions,"* and say with Kant that "an erring conscience is a chimera."†

The principle that Coleridge laid down is undoubtedly a sound one, viz.: "Until you have mastered the fundamental difference, in kind, between the reason and the understanding as faculties of the human mind, you cannot escape a thousand difficulties in philosophy. It is pre-eminently the *Gradus ad Philosophiam*."‡ Reason, then, is best defined as the power of mind which enables us to recognize self-evident truth, in contrast with reasoning or the understanding, which has to do with judgments or conclusions based upon such recognized truth. The difference is probably best expressed in the Greek words *νοῦς* and *διανοία*,—*νοῦς*, of course, answering to reason, *διανοία* to understanding.

Without stopping to argue the point as to the origin of knowledge, whether it be a development, under natural law, from our simplest state, or whether it be an intuition as regards first principles, it is affirmed that there are certain truths which are self-evident. The knowledge of these truths is immediate. As soon as they are understood, they are accepted as true. So early a philosopher as Cicero stated this very clearly. *Quæ ita sunt in promptu, ut res disputatione non egeat*.§ A plainer statement of this point than that given by Dr. Reid is hardly possible; "There are propositions which are no sooner understood than they are believed * * * there is no searching for evidence, no weighing of arguments; the proposition is not deduced or inferred from another; it has the light of truth in itself, and has no occasion to borrow it from another. These truths are called first principles, principles of common sense, common notions, self-evident truths."|| Of these first principles, some are first principles of intellectual truth and some of moral

* Lowell Lectures—*The Application of Metaphysical and Ethical Science to the Evidence of Religion*, p. 274. Boston, 1849.

† *Metaphysic of Ethics*, p. 206, Semple's translation. Edinburgh, 1869.

‡ This is concisely stated in the *Table Talk*, p. 72. Worthington, New York, 1884. It is elaborately discussed in *Aids to Reflection*, p. 161 et seq. New York, n. d.

§ *De Officiis*, bk. I. ch. ii., p. 9. New York, 1866.

|| *Intellectual Powers*, Essay VI. ch. 3, p. 365, Walker's edition. Boston, 1857.

truth. The former are laws of intelligence, the latter of conduct. These two classes of truth are, however, apprehended by the same power—reason, *νοῦς*. But when this power is exercised on truths in purely intellectual relations, it is distinguished as intellectual or speculative reason, and when on truths in exclusively moral relations as moral or practical reason.*

And now we are ready to make the term conscience apply to "Reason in its moral applications, as contrasted with reason in its speculative bearings." Conscience is, then, an original faculty of man's moral constitution, by which moral law is discovered to him for the guidance of his conduct. It is different from feeling, to which Hume assigns "the final award," different from affections, or emotions, or desires. It is a cognitive power. Conscience, *con-sciousness*, *con-scientia*, *συν-εἰδήσις*, a knowing with one's self, or as the late Bishop Martensen says, "man's joint acquaintance with himself and God."† The word in its first plain meaning should be kept in mind. Conscience is a knowing with, a consciousness of something or of some one.

Just as there is a power of mind which perceives intuitively simple fact, so there is a power of mind which perceives intuitively general truths or principles; and when the truths or principles so perceived are moral, the power recognizing them is conscience, or the practical reason. It is important that this definition be fully understood. Conscience intuitively, that is, without education, without induction, recognizes moral law. Just as the eye sees the object, or the ear hears the sound, so does conscience discover moral law, and for this reason has been called by some philosophers "the sixth sense."‡

If conscience discovers to us all moral law, it follows that it has authority over all other powers of the mind.

* As is well-known, this distinction, which lies at the basis of our study, was formally enunciated by Kant.

† Martensen's *Christian Ethics* pt. III., sec. 117, p. 256, Edinburgh, 1879. Conscience is also defined to be "The ideal man in us," p. 357, and "The consciousness of eternity," p. 360, where the learned Bishop approaches the thought of Prof. Wace, *Boyle Lectures for 1875*, that conscience is the personal presence of God in the soul.

‡ Prof. Calderwood's *Handbook of Moral Philosophy*, p. 81, eighth edit. London, 1881.

Everything in human nature operates according to a law of its own. The affections and desires are dependent for direction upon intelligence, "while for performance of its special function intelligence is dependent on its possession of moral law." Thus the power that discovers moral law is supreme over all others.* The faculty that discovers moral law must have the teaching authority which belongs to that law. But this law, because it is absolute truth, admits of no contradiction. And so, of necessity, the discoverer of the law can submit to no contradiction. But that which discovers moral law is conscience; therefore conscience is supreme over every other power in teaching function.†

If the positions already taken be true, viz.: that conscience is an original faculty of man's moral constitution, that it intuitively recognizes moral law, that it is supreme over all other powers, then it follows that it cannot err, and so cannot be educated. If we need "to labor to enlighten and instruct our conscience," as Dr. Whewell says, then it must be deficient in guiding power and authority; and if it is deficient in these, it is not supreme. Butler's strong point falls to the ground. Anybody who holds that conscience intuitively recognizes moral law, and that it is supreme in its authority, must hold, if he would be consistent, that it cannot be educated. These propositions stand or fall together.

In saying that conscience cannot be educated, it is not said that there is not need of moral training, but just the reverse. The very essence of moral training lies right here: in the personal experience in the application of the truth discovered by conscience to practice, and in the "personal attainment in the practical subordination of

* Bishop Butler, in his *Sermons on Human Nature*, has established the supremacy of conscience on a basis that cannot be shaken. Plainly and indisputably has he shown that conscience is vested with sovereign practical authority.

† It should not be overlooked, however, that the authority of this faculty conscience is not to be sought in the nature of the faculty itself, but in the character of the truth it discovers. The truth is the thing in which we must look for any inherent authority. It needs to be insisted upon, as a caution against some of the inferences that may be drawn from Bishop Butler, that the faculty which perceives self-evident truth adds nothing to the truth perceived. Whatever inherent authority there is, belongs to the truth itself, and not to the faculty discovering it. Prof. Calderwood, p. 80.

every other power to the authority of conscience." My conscience discovers to me a truth, a moral law; now because this is a truth, because this is an absolute moral law, therefore it ought to be done. If I do it, I am working in harmony with my nature; if I refuse, I am acting unnaturally, that is, against nature. There is, in either case, a training either for the better or the worse. Those philosophers who have held that conscience needed to be educated have generally overlooked the distinction between conscience and moral judgments.* It is impossible to understand the position that conscience cannot be educated unless distinction be made between judgments on moral questions and intuitive perceptions of moral law. At the basis of all investigation there must be laid down this fact: that the foundation of moral distinctions is independent of human personality. The eternal difference between right and wrong emanates from no less a source than God Himself. Goodness and truthfulness are not what each man thinks them to be, but they are the same eternally, because they are of God. But now comes another question, viz.: how is the knowledge of moral distinctions derived? By reason. A knowledge of moral distinction is impossible by sensation or perception. It has the nature of a judgment and must be obtained by comparison.† The knowledge of an action as fact is less than the knowledge of the act as morally right or wrong.

* A good example of this is furnished by Archbishop Whately: "Any one whose conscience has been in anyway depraved, and who is proceeding on some wrong principle, *cannot possibly act rightly*, whether he acts according to his conscience or against it, till he is cured of this defect in his moral judgment. "If, however," he piously adds, "any one has done his best to form a right judgment, but has fallen into error through unavoidable ignorance or weakness of understanding, we may hope that his All-seeing and Merciful Judge will pardon this involuntary error." In this passage conscience and moral judgment are used as synonyms, and we see the almost horrible conclusion to which the Archbishop was led as a consequence.

† A knowledge of moral distinction cannot be gained by sensation, for sensation is "the involuntary experience consequent upon personal relation to a sensitive organism, or to objects capable of making impressions on that organism," as for example, heat, cold, pain. Sensation, therefore, is neither an act nor the knowledge of an act. Neither is a knowledge of moral distinction to be had by Perception. Perception is a simple recognition of fact, and can include only such facts as are capable of being known by simple observation, without comparison, without inference. Perception, for example, "gives knowledge of an extended surface, but not of its measure; of a signal, but not of its meaning; of an action, but not of its moral character." These things—measure of a surface, meaning of a signal, character of an action—must be known by comparison or inference. They require the application of a standard. Cf. *Handbook, of Philosophy*, p. 26, et seq.

The first may be gained by perception, the second only by comparison. The familiar example is given by moral philosophers of the infliction of pain by one upon another. "In one case we may record it as morally right, in another as morally wrong. If the relations of persons be that of parent and child; if the motive of the parent be desire of the child's improvement; and the warrant, a parent's right to restrain obedience in a child, we pronounce one verdict. On the other hand, if the persons concerned are related as neighbors, and if the suffering is inflicted in malice, we give an opposite verdict. In either case we form a judgment." And the judgment is formed, not by the comparison of separate, individual objects, but by the comparison of a particular act with a general truth. There must be a definite standard by which all acts must be measured—one supreme absolute right to which all others are related. Moral judgments, in involving the application of a particular action to a general truth, presupposes a knowledge of that truth as a requisite for the discovery of moral distinctions among actions. It is impossible from their very nature to maintain a reasoned contradiction of the general truths involved in moral judgments. The general truths that truthfulness is right, that benevolence is right, and other like ones, are not the results of induction, but are self-evident. "They are as clearly recognized when a single testing case is presented for adjudication, as when a thousand such cases have been decided. The rightness of honesty, for instance, is not proved by an induction of particulars. But the conclusion that 'honesty is the best policy' is essentially a generalization from experience."*

Some effort has been made to make clear the distinction between moral judgments and intuitive perceptions of moral law. These things are distinct, and should be

* Prof. Calderwood, in his chapter on "First Principles of Morals," states the point here with admirable clearness: "It is needful to distinguish between the *action*, the *judgment*, as to its moral character, the *warrant* for their judgment, and the *abstraction* which represents the particular form of moral quality present, viz: Honesty. Exchange of property by mutual consent may stand for the example. The judgment is that the acquisition of property in such a manner is morally right. What then is the warrant for this judgment? The sole warrant is the self-evident truth, Honesty is right. Acquisition by equivalent given is honest."

kept so. Judgments, convictions, feelings, are not intuitions. We must get behind these if we would know what conscience is. It is because conscience has been used as a synonym for moral judgment, that there have arisen such phrases, even in philosophy, of an enlightened, a tender, a seared conscience, etc. Conscience properly so called, moral judgments, and moral sentiments are often referred to one power. By an enlightened conscience we ought to mean an enlightened judgment, a clear discernment of outward duty. A tender conscience is a keen sensibility in reference to right and wrong. A seared conscience is a hardened sensibility, an obtuseness of feeling in reference to moral conduct, the result of habits of sin. But the rational faculty of conscience, that which perceives obligation, cannot be perverted.* Tertullian was on the way to the truth when he wrote *extingui non potest, quia a Deo est*†

The great objection that is made against the theory of conscience which has been put forth is, the diversity of moral judgments among men. This objection cannot be fully answered in this paper. Only a hint or two can be thrown out. A distinction between right and wrong in human conduct is admitted by all nations. Diversity of opinion on moral subjects is concerned not so much with deciding what is right as the determination of what is wrong. It is not as to the principles, but as to the application of these principles in given circumstances, that men differ. "Contradictory moral judgments imply error somewhere; that error is capable of being detected and exposed; its detection and exposure imply possession of a common, unvarying standard of morals."‡ And this absolute standard of morals is not discovered by induction, by any process of reasoning, nor is it a growth or development, nor is it the accumulation of experience, but is intuitively perceived by conscience, to do which is its special and supreme function. The whole matter is clearly and strongly put by Kant: "Conscience is man's

* Cf. Fairchild, *Mor. Phil.*, pp. 83, 84.

† *De Anima*, c. 41.

‡ Calderwood's *Handbook*, pp. 83, 84. Cf. the whole of ch. iv. pt. I.

practical reason, which does, in all circumstances, hold before him his law of duty * * * * when it is said in common parlance that such an one has no conscience, that means merely that he disregards its dictates * * *
 * * *an erring conscience is a chimera* * * * *
 In the court of conscience nothing is settled amicably, but according to the rigor of the law."*

The advocates of the other theory, that conscience not only can but ought to be instructed, bring forward, with remarkable unanimity, the two examples of Saul of Tarsus and the laws of Sparta in regard to theft as proofs of the diversity of moral judgments; from which they argue the liability of conscience to error, and its need of enlightenment. But if one examines the case of Saul he cannot fail to see that, instead of acting according to, he acted against conscience. He had not a right or benevolent heart, and hence failed to meet the primary requisition of conscience, which is benevolence. His own testimony is conclusive: "And I punished them oft in every synagogue, and compelled them to blaspheme, and *being exceedingly mad* against them, I persecuted them even unto strange cities." He showed in this a spirit utterly opposed to benevolence. He knew that the hatred he cherished was wrong.† And in regard to the laws of Sparta, it should be borne in mind that "when theft was publicly honored and rewarded in Sparta, it was not" (as Dr. Chalmers points out), "because theft in itself was reckoned a good thing, but because patriotism and dexterity and those services by which the interests of patriotism might be supported were reckoned to be good things."‡ As is well known, the boy was punished if caught in the act.

The theory that conscience is a subordinate and fallible guide finds its logical conclusion in the destruction of man's responsibility. It is just because man has an infallible guide in him that discovers to him absolute law that he is a responsible agent. Certainly a blind man

* *Metaphysic of Ethics*, p. 206, Semple's translation, Edinburgh, 1869.

† Cf. Fairchild, *Moral Philosophy*, p. 81.

‡ Chalmers *On the Moral and Intellectual Constitution of Man*. Bridgewater Treatises, vol. I. p. 103, London, Pickering, 1839.

with a blind guide cannot be held accountable if he fall into the ditch.* If there is to be consistency in human life, there must be an absolute standard, absolute truth, absolute law. Without these everything is swallowed up in individualism. There must be a common rule of conduct for humanity, to which the actions of man yesterday, to-day and to-morrow must be brought into harmony. And this absolute standard is discovered to us by conscience. From its very nature, then, conscience is a faculty which is not educatable. It is as impossible to teach the conscience how to perceive self-evident truths, and what truths are of this nature as it is to teach the eye

* It would be unfair to omit all reference to the position and the grounds therefor of those holding the opposite view to that here taken. And among these is so justly-celebrated a man as Dr. Whewell. I take particular pleasure in quoting him because he is the great champion of the theory that conscience should be instructed. The following quotations are from *Elements of Morality*, book III. ch. xiv. pp. 262, et seq., Harper's 1857: "He who is condemned by his own conscience is guilty. He has really done wrong. He has really offended against the Supreme Rule. He who acts against his conscience is always wrong. The question naturally occurs, whether, on the other hand, he who acts according to his conscience is always right. It is evident, that to answer this question in the affirmative would lead to great inconsistencies in our morality. Men have often committed thefts, frauds, impositions, homicides, thinking their actions right, though they were such as all moralists would condemn as wrong. Such men acted according to their consciences. Were they thereby justified?" He answers the question in the negative. "We must labor to enlighten and instruct our conscience. This task can never be ended. Conscience is never fully formed, but always in the course of formation * * * It appears from what has been said, that we cannot properly refer to our conscience as an ultimate and supreme authority. It has only a subordinate and intermediate authority. Since conscience is thus a subordinate and fallible guide, it appears, that for a man to act according to his conscience is not necessarily to act rightly. His conscience may be erroneous." And on the very next page he says: "Conscience is to each man the representative of the Supreme Law, and it is invested with the authority of the Supreme Law. It is the voice which pronounces for him the distinction of right and wrong, of moral good and evil; and when he has done all that he can to enlighten and instruct it, it is for him the Voice of God." It does not require much discernment to detect the inconsistency here. Conscience is "always forming," always incomplete; it is therefore "a subordinate and fallible guide;" even after we have done all that we can to enlighten and instruct it, by the aid of Religion, as well as morality, it still cannot always be relied on as a safe guide, and yet Dr. Whewell says, it is for the man the very "Voice of God." Surely, this is to make God speak a lie; this is to make man most miserable indeed. If he acts against his conscience, he is wrong. If he acts according to his conscience, he may be wrong. Even after he has done all that a man can do, by the aid of every means that God has given, to enlighten and instruct that conscience, and though that conscience be the very voice of God speaking to the man, yet he is not certain that he is right, he may be wrong; a lie may be in his right hand.

Dr. Alexander, of Princeton, puts the same conclusion that Whewell reached in a plainer and more straightforward manner. He throws off the ornaments of diction and rhetoric that help to cover up Whewell's thought and gives it to us in its nakedness. Says Dr. Alexander: "It is true if a man's conscience dictates a certain action, he is morally bound to obey; but if that action is in itself wrong, he commits sin in performing it, nevertheless. He who is under fundamental error is in a sad dilemma. Do what he will, he sins. If he disobey conscience he knowingly sins,

how and what to see or the ear how and what to hear.* The fact that all need to be instructed in matters of duty is not doubted, but this is a totally different question from that of the education of conscience. "The judgment may be educated to discern more clearly the objective right; the feeling of obligation may be quickened by culture, and the æsthetic moral sense may be developed and modified; but in none of these senses is conscience made by education."† A knowledge of moral law—a law, for instance, of truthfulness, or benevolence, or justice—is the underlying test of all our thoughts and feelings on moral subjects, and this knowledge, let it be said again, is to be referred to an intuitive power. Conclusions, of whatever sort, whether sound or unsound, are not intuitive, but are products of the reasoning power. In saying that conscience cannot be educated, it is only said that intuition is and must be independent of training. If conscience intuitively recognizes moral law, if it is supreme in its authority, then it must follow that it can not be educated. "This faculty was placed within us (I am here closing with the words of Bishop Butler) to be our proper governor; to divert and regulate all under principles, passions, and motives of action. This is its right and office. Thus sacred is its authority. And how often soever men violate and rebelliously refuse to submit to it, for supposed interest which they cannot otherwise gratify; this makes no alteration as to the natural right and office of conscience." "Had it strength, as it has right; had it power, as it has manifest authority, it would absolutely govern the world."‡

JOHN ADDISON CROCKETT.

doing what he believes to be wrong, even though it should turn out to be right. And if he obey conscience, performing an act which is in itself wrong, he sins, because he complies not with the law under which he is placed." A sad dilemma indeed!

* Cf. Prof. Diman's Lectures on *The Theistic Argument*, p. 251 et seq.

† Fairchild, *Moral Philosophy*, p. 83.

‡ II. Sermon on Human Nature.

NATURAL LAW IN THE SPIRITUAL WORLD.

A N amount of material that would once have been extended over the surface of half a dozen huge folios, is here condensed into one octavo volume of a little more than four hundred pages. To give an intelligible analysis of such a work within the brief space at my command is very difficult; to do anything like justice to the work is impossible. Abstruse as are many of the principles which the author develops, his mode of presenting them is clear as the day, and the richness and rareness of the illustrations which he draws from the realms of Science and Nature give to his work a very peculiar charm. There is nothing here of the *siccum lumen* of metaphysics or theology,—it is more like a philosophical poem than a treatise of polemics. Every little while there appears on the right hand or the left, some side-opening into the far-off mysteries of nature and revelation, some unexpected rift in the landscape, some strange and beautiful vista, which tempts the reader to linger on the way and would greatly retard his progress, if it were not for the constraining force that impels him onward. Mr. Drummond possesses, in a wonderful degree, what "The Country Parson" calls "The art of putting things,"—and his style is prismatic as well as clear. His coloring is as rich as his drawing is accurate.

I will now put this book into a condensing machine, and do what I can to indicate the general principles by which the discovery of "Natural Law in the Spiritual World" has been determined by Mr. Drummond; and it certainly deserves to be called a *discovery*, inasmuch as he has opened a new line of thought, so far as the estab-

lishment of scientific truth upon a strictly scientific basis is concerned. A brief extract from the Preface reveals the motive and principle, which led to the production of the work:

Can we shut our eyes to the fact that the religious opinions of mankind are in a state of flux? And when we regard the uncertainty of current beliefs, the war of creeds, the havoc of inevitable as well as idle doubt, the reluctant abandonment of early faith by those who would cherish it longer if they could, is it not plain that the one thing thinking men are waiting for is the introduction of Law among the Phenomena of the Spiritual World? When that comes we shall offer to such men a truly scientific theology. And the Reign of Law will transform the whole Spiritual World as it has already transformed the Natural World.

The author opens the gate by which we enter the road along which he proposes to lead us, by showing what Science, in these later ages, has done for nature:

In the earlier centuries, before the birth of Science, Phenomena were studied alone. The world then was a chaos, a collection of single, isolated, and independent facts. Deeper thinkers saw, indeed, that relations must exist between these facts, but the Reign of Law was never more to the ancients than a far-off vision.

The fundamental conception of Law is an ascertained working sequence or constant order among the Phenomena of Nature. In its true sense Natural Law predicates nothing of causes. The Natural Laws originate nothing, sustain nothing; they are merely responsible for uniformity in sustaining what has been originated and what is being sustained. They are modes of operation, therefore, and not operators; processes, not powers.

The question now arises, Do these lines of Law stop with what we call the Natural sphere? Is it not possible that they may lead further? Is it probable that the Hand which ruled them gave up the work where most of all they were required? Did that Hand divide the world into two, a cosmos and a chaos, the higher being the chaos? With Nature as the symbol of all of harmony and beauty that is known to man, must we still talk of the supernatural, not as a convenient word, but as a different order of world, an unintelligible world, where the Reign of Mystery supersedes the Reign of Law?

This is the problem which the work before us attempts to solve. It is perfectly evident that Natural Law must

extend to every sphere in the universe, where the same physical conditions exist.

But, according to Mr. Drummond, the Natural Laws, as the Law of Continuity might well warn us, do not stop with the visible and then give place to a new set of laws bearing a strong similitude to them. The Laws of the invisible are the same Laws, projections of the natural, not supernatural. Analogous phenomena are not the fruit of parallel Laws, but of the same Laws—Laws which at one end, as it were, may be dealing with matter, at the other end with spirit.

It is not to be inferred from this somewhat unqualified statement, that the writer intends in the slightest degree to diminish the dignity of the great principles by which the spiritual world is regulated; as he goes on to show in detail how the majestic truths of revelation have for their basis the same scientific formulæ which in modern days have reduced the world of nature to an orderly and consistent system, we are impressed by a deeper sense of moral and spiritual truth, because it is made so much more real and apprehensible. He *assumes* that there are two distinct realms in the universe, which, for want of any better terms, we call the Natural and Spiritual, and as each department in nature, the mechanical, chemical, biological, and so on, has its own special laws, there must also be a corresponding distinction in the laws which regulate the two great departments of nature and spirit.

Room is still left for mystery. Had no place remained for mystery it had proved itself both unscientific and irreligious. A Science without mystery is unknown; a Religion without mystery is absurd. This is no attempt to reduce Religion to a question of mathematics, or demonstrate God in biological formulæ. The elimination of mystery from the universe is the elimination of Religion.

Herbert Spencer, in his recent article on the Retrospect and Prospect of Religion, writes as follows:—"Those who think that Science is dissipating religious beliefs and sentiments, seem unaware that whatever of mystery is taken from the old interpretation is added to the new. Or rather, we may say that transference from the one to the other is accompanied by increase; since, for an explanation which has a seeming feasibility, Science substitutes an explana-

tion which, conveying us back only a certain distance, there leaves us in presence of the avowedly inexplicable."

That Science has its mysteries and demands of its votaries the exercise of faith as well as of knowledge, is more generally admitted to-day than it was in former ages.

The one subject on which all scientific men are agreed, the one theme at which all alike become eloquent, the one strain of pathos in all their writing and speaking and thinking, concerns that final uncertainty, that utter blackness of darkness bounding their work on every side.

As Science, which at one time was content, or professed to be content, in studying the phenomena of nature, with determining the question of the How, is now beginning to interest itself in the Why; so there is a multitude of people who, when they are told what they ought to believe in Religion, are asking with not a little trembling of heart, "Why must I believe?"

Authority never satisfied thinking men so little as it does now. We are obliged, as a matter of necessity, to accept the *ipse dixit* of one who has explored a region that lies beyond our ken, as in the case of the higher mathematics, which only the profoundest expert is competent to understand, but when it comes to the announcement of moral truths, which appeal to our moral sense, or theological dogmas which appeal to the reason, we feel that we are at liberty, nay, that we are bound to sit in judgment upon those truths and dogmas, in the independent exercise of the faculties to which they are addressed. And I have no question that, while Science will in due time retire from the contest which it now holds with revealed and all other forms of Religion, with its vision purged to take in a vast area of spiritual truth which it now either ignores or denies, so theology will retire from the contest, for want of an adversary, purified of many errors and falsities, and with its claims resting on a sure and tried foundation, which the truest science will not venture or care to gainsay.

In the words of the author:

With the inspiration of Nature to illuminate what the inspiration of revelation has left obscure, heresy in certain whole departments shall

become impossible. With the demonstration of the naturalness of the supernatural, scepticism even may come to be regarded as unscientific. And those who have wrestled long for a few bare truths to ennoble life and rest their souls in thinking of the future, will not be left in doubt.

The fact that there can be no sharp line separating the spiritual from the natural, is based upon the Law of Continuity. As a matter of convenience, we divide the natural world into different kingdoms, and find a certain law or rule by which each of them is regulated and its various processes are evolved:

So long, however, as these Laws were merely great lines running through Nature, so long as they remained isolated from each other, the system of Nature was still incomplete. The principle which sought Law among phenomena had to go further and seek a law among the Laws. Laws themselves came to be treated as they treated phenomena, and found themselves finally grouped in a still narrower circle. That inmost circle is governed by one great Law, the Law of Continuity. It is the Law for Laws.

To the obvious objection that the natural laws which are continuous through the universe of matter and of space, cannot be continuous throughout the universe of spirit, because they have no connection whatever with the spiritual world, as, for instance, the law of gravitation, we are told this assumes what cannot be proved.

It is quite true that when we pass from the Inorganic to the Organic, we come upon a new set of laws. But the reason why the lesser set do not seem to act in the higher sphere is not that they are annihilated, but that they are overruled. And the reason why the higher Laws are not found operating in the lower is not because they are not continuous downward, but because there is nothing for them to act upon. It is not Law that fails, but opportunity. The biological Laws are continuous for life. Wherever there is life, that is to say, they will be found acting, just as gravitation acts wherever there is matter.

We are to infer from this that if there is anything in the spiritual world, upon which the law of gravitation can expend itself, its presence will be manifested; if not, there will be no such manifestation, while the law itself still exists there.

As we have already seen, our author does not deny that there may be new and special laws in the spiritual

sphere, just as there are laws in the organic world which have no place in the inorganic, but we do not know what they are, for the reason that they have no analogies in the realm of nature. "Our knowledge of higher law must be limited by our knowledge of the lower."

Every one admits that there are many and striking analogies in the realm of nature and the realm of spirit, as is seen in the fact that spiritual truths can be expressed only by sensible images. Principal Shairp is quoted to this effect: "This seeing of spiritual truths mirrored in the face of nature rests not on any fancied, but in a real, analogy between the natural and the spiritual worlds. They are in some sense which Science has not ascertained, but which the vital and religious imagination can conceive, counterparts one of the other." "But," Mr. Drummond goes on to say, "is not this the explanation, that parallel phenomena depend upon identical law? It is a question indeed whether one can speak of laws at all as being analogous? Phenomena are parallel, laws which make them so are themselves one."

And, as the author well says, "The true greatness of Law lies in its vision of the unseen. Law in the visible is the invisible in the visible, and to speak of laws as natural is to define them in their application to a part of the unseen, the sense part, whereas a wider survey would lead us to regard all laws as essentially spiritual." The writer of that most suggestive book, entitled *The Unseen Universe*, affirms that "Matter is (though it may seem paradoxical to say so) the less important half of the material of the physical universe." And even Mr. Huxley, though in a different sense, assures us, with Descartes, "That we know more of mind than we do of body; that the immaterial world is a firmer reality than one material."

I have now indicated, although in a very imperfect manner, the general grounds upon which the writer of the work before us, rests his arguments.

The first application which Mr. Drummond makes of the principle of Natural Law in the Spiritual World is connected with what is known in theology as the doctrine of

Regeneration, or, as it may be otherwise termed, the origin of spiritual life. The doctrine of Biogenesis, or life only from life, is acknowledged by Mr. Huxley to be "victorious along the whole line at the present day." Mr. Tyndale says, perhaps reluctantly, "I affirm that no shred of trustworthy experimental testimony exists to prove that life in our day has ever appeared independently of antecedent life."

As in the domain of natural science, so in the domain of Theology, there have always been two great schools, one holding "that the spiritual life in man can only come from pre-existing life, the other that it can spontaneously generate itself."

The dogma that "the spiritual man is no mere development of the natural man," which has heretofore rested exclusively upon the declarations of Scripture, it is now proposed to confirm by applying to it the law of Biogenesis, the great fact that there is no such thing as a spontaneous generation of life. There is no passage from the inorganic to the organic, from the mineral to the animal world,—it is only "by the bending down into this dead world of some living form that these dead atoms can be gifted with the properties of vitality, and without this preliminary contact with life they remain fixed in the inorganic sphere forever." And "the passage from the Natural World to the Spiritual World is hermetically sealed on the natural side. The space from the inorganic to the organic is shut, no mineral can open it; so the space from the natural to the spiritual is shut, and no man can open it."

If any one denies the existence of a spiritual world, this law of analogy goes for nothing, and unfortunately we have amongst us a school of scientific men who do deny it, just because it is not materialized before their eyes in nature. They decline altogether to discuss the question of law in the spiritual world, on the ground that that is a realm about which we know nothing. Here Theology and Science must part company; the difference between them is irreconcilable. Looking at the matter from his standpoint, the assumption of the materialist is

perfectly reasonable, and it is useless for the theologian to make the effort to construct a spiritual world out of anything that is furnished to his hand in the world of nature.

What is this but the demand that a lower world, hermetically sealed against all communication with the world above it, should have a mature and intelligent acquaintance with its phenomena and laws? Can the mineral discourse to the animal life? Can it tell me what lies beyond the narrow boundary of its inert being? Knowing nothing of other than the chemical and physical laws, what is its criticism worth of the principles of Biology? The barrier which separates Kingdoms from one another restricts mind not less than matter. Any information of the Kingdoms above it that could come to the mineral world, could only come by a communication intelligible as well as credible, but the information in the first instance must be vouchsafed as a *revelation*. Similarly if those in the Organic Kingdom are to know anything of the Spiritual World, that knowledge must at least begin as Revelation. Men who reject this source of information, by the law of Biogenesis, can have no other.

Assuming that the existence of a spiritual world has been revealed by direct inspiration, in other words, by the action of the Infinite Mind upon the finite mind, our author sums up what he has to say on the first head of discourse in these words:

It is clear that a remarkable harmony exists here between the Organic World as arranged by Science and the Spiritual World as arranged by Scripture. We find one great law guarding the thresholds of both worlds, securing that entrance from a lower sphere only take place by a direct regenerating act, and that emanating from the world next in order above. There are not two laws of Biogenesis, one for the Natural and the other for the Spiritual; one law is for both. Wherever there is Life, Life of any kind, this same law holds. The analogy therefore is only among the Phenomena; between Laws there is no analogy—there is Continuity. In either case, the first step in peopling these worlds with the appropriate living forms is virtually miracle. Nor in one case is there less of mystery in the act than in the other. The second birth is scarcely less perplexing to the theologian than the first to the embryologist."

All this is illustrated by the author with a singular richness of thought and a simple beauty of style, which

may well be commended to those who make profound things more obscure and incomprehensible, by the way in which they handle them.

Mr. Drummond next presents to us the law of degeneration, as it operates in the world of nature, and then goes on to show how it works after precisely the same fashion in the world of spirit. There is something very impressive and startling in his treatment of this subject. The penalty, exacted by sin, becomes all the more rigid and terrible, when we see that there is nothing arbitrary about it, but simply the working of a law, which is as inexorable in the moral world as the law of gravitation is in the physical.

In the dominion of nature, degeneration comes, not of necessity by any specific active interference, but as the mere result of neglect. A garden left to itself runs to weeds. So there is "a retrograde principle in the being of every man."

Apart even from the law of Degeneration, apart from Perversion of Type, there is in every living organism a law of Death. We are wont to imagine that Nature is full of life. In reality it is full of Death. One cannot say that it is natural for a plant to live. Examine its nature fully, and you have to admit that its natural tendency is to die. It is the very forces which we associate with life which, when their true nature appears, are discovered to be really the ministers of death. This law, which is true for the whole plant world, is also valid for the animal and for man. Air is not life, but corruption; so literally corruption that the only way to keep out corruption, when life has ebbed, is to keep out the air."

Life is the sum total of the functions which resist death. Spiritual life, in like manner, is the sum total of the functions which resist sin. The soul that sinneth must die, because 'it has neglected the functions which resist death, and has always been dying.'

There is a natural principle in man lowering him, deadening him, pulling him down by inches to the mere natural plane, blinding reason searing conscience, paralysing will. This is the active destroying principle, or sin. Now to counteract this, God has discovered to us another principle which will stop this drifting process in the soul, steer it round, and make it drift the other way. This is the active saving principle, or Salvation.

The process of spiritual degeneration, as illustrated and made certain by natural laws is described with frightful fidelity; but I must pass hastily on to speak of what the author has to say of the law of Growth. The first point that he makes is, that growth is spontaneous. Things do not grow by trying.

One would never think of telling a boy to grow. A doctor has no prescription for growth. No physician of souls, in like manner, has any prescription for spiritual growth. It is the question he is most often asked and most often answers wrongly.

Mr. Drummond does not question the fact that there are certain conditions, amenable to our will, which make growth possible, as there are also conditions which make it impossible,—a tree must have soil, light, heat, and moisture, in order to grow, but if the principle of life is wanting, no outward conditions can make it grow. He makes the difference between a Christian and a moralist to lie in this fact,—the one works from the centre, and the other from the circumference.

The one is an organism, in the centre of which is planted by the living GOD a living germ. The other is a crystal, very beautiful it may be; but only a crystal—it wants the vital principle of growth.

The second point is, the mysteriousness of growth; the peculiarity of it is, that you cannot account for it.

This is true in every department and of course involves the spiritual. The duty of a man is to put himself in the right spiritual relation, and then he will grow, not by trying to grow, but by a process which he cannot comprehend. It is granted 'that by hard work and self-restraint a man may attain to a very high character.' But what is denied is, that this is growth, and that this process is Christianity. The fact that you can account for it proves that it is not growth.

It is in this way that the author finds a scientific status for the doctrine that salvation is by faith, and not by works:

Not that there is no work for him who would grow, to do. There is work, and severe work,—work so great that the worker deserves to be relieved of all that is superfluous during his task. If the amount of energy lost in trying to grow were spent in fulfilling the conditions of growth, we should have many more cubits to show for our stature.

From the consideration of the law of growth, the author passes to the subject of spiritual death, which he also illustrates by the scientific laws of natural death, and shows them to be identical. If life is the adjustment of internal to external relations, death is the being drawn out of correspondence with one's environment. A man may be in one sense dead, and in another sense, alive; if he is blind, he is dead to objects of vision—if he is deaf, he is dead to sounds. All the lower organisms are partly dead and partly alive, and as we rise in the scale of existence, the range of life increases.

In the spiritual world, we have also to deal with organism and environment. The same relation exists between them, which we find in the natural world. If the soul is not conscious of its whole environment,—if it does not correspond with, know, and become subject to the influence of any part of the environment, it is so far ahead.

'To be carnally minded is death.' To be carnally minded, translated into the language of Science, is to be limited in one's correspondence to the environment of the natural man. What is the creed of the Agnostic, but the confession of the spiritual numbness of humanity? The negative doctrine which it reiterates with such sad persistency, what is it but the echo of the oldest of scientific and religious truths? The nescience of the Agnostic philosophy is the proof from experience that to be carnally minded is death.

I must pass the chapter on mortification, and say a few words in explanation of what is perhaps the most profound and suggestive portion of Mr. Drummond's work, viz., the establishment of the Christian doctrine of Eternal Life upon a scientific foundation. He begins with quoting from Herbert Spencer as follows:

Perfect correspondence would be perfect life. Were there no changes in the environment but such as the organism had adapted changes to meet, and were it never to fail in the efficiency with which it met them, there would be eternal existence and eternal knowledge.

The author then goes on to say,

One of the most startling achievements of recent Science is a definition of Eternal Life. To the religious mind this is a contribution of immense moment. For eighteen hundred years only one definition of

Life Eternal was before the world. Now there are two. Through all these centuries revealed religion had this doctrine to itself. Apart from Revelation, this great truth was non-guaranteed. It was the one thing in the Christian system that most needed verification from without, yet none was forthcoming. And never has any further light been thrown upon the question why in its very nature the Christian Life should be Eternal. Christianity itself ever upon this point has been obscure. Its decision upon the bare fact is authoritative and specific. But as to what there is in the Spiritual Life necessarily endowing it with the elements of Eternity, the maturest theology is all but silent.

We have had a variety of arguments against annihilation, drawn from various analogies in nature, which were never very satisfactory, but now, as Mr. Drummond claims, "For the first time Science touches Christianity positively in the direction of Immortality." The elaborate argument which he brings to bear upon the subject, I will condense into the fewest possible words, that will serve to make it intelligible.

Mr. Herbert Spencer, without any reference to Religion, defines the terms or conditions, according to which life is high or low, long or short. Recalling the definition which has already been given of life and death, we are to observe that "a distinct relation exists between complexity and longevity. The organism with the most perfect set of correspondences, that is, the highest and most complex organism, has an obvious advantage over less complex forms. It can adjust itself more perfectly and frequently. But this is just the biological way of saying that it can live the longest."

In solving the problem of an eternal life, "the desideratum is an organism with a correspondence of a very exceptional kind." It must lie beyond the reach of those "mechanical actions" and those "variations of available food which," as Mr. Spencer says, "are liable to stop the processes going on in the organism."

Before we reach an eternal life we must pass beyond that point at which all ordinary correspondences inevitably cease. We must find an organism, so high and complex that at some point in its development it shall have added a correspondence which organic death is powerless to arrest. The environment of the spiritual world is outside the influence

of these 'mechanical actions,' which sooner or later interrupt the processes going on in all finite organisms. If then we can find an organism which has established a correspondence with the spiritual world, that correspondence will possess the elements of eternity—provided only one other condition be fulfilled. That condition is that the environment be perfect.

These general principles of modern philosophy are applied to the Scriptural doctrine of eternal life with a subtlety and skill, which can be appreciated only by the careful study of Mr. Drummond's argument. I have now to quote only one thing further, in connection with this part of the subject.

Nature, the natural environment, is only a part of environment. There is another large part which, though some profess to have no correspondence with it, is not on that account unreal, or even unnatural. The mental and moral world is unknown to the plant. But it is real. It cannot be affirmed either that it is unnatural to the plant; although it might be said that from the point of view of the vegetable kingdom, it was *supernatural*. Things are natural or supernatural simply according to where one stands. Man is supernatural to the mineral; God is supernatural to the man. When a mineral is seized upon by the living plant and elevated to the organic kingdom, no trespass against nature is committed. It merely enters a larger environment, which before was supernatural to it, but which now is entirely natural. When the heart of man, again, is seized upon by the quickening Spirit of God, no further violence is done to natural law. It is another case, so to speak, of the inorganic passing into the organic.

The Scriptural doctrine of "communion with God" is treated by the author under the head of Environment, and here we are brought face to face with Mr. Herbert Spencer, who affirms that "It is a corollary from that fundamental truth which, as we have seen, underlies all other truths, that whatever amount of power an organism expects in any shape, is the correlated equivalent of a power that was taken into it from without." "Whatever energy the soul expends must be taken into it from without. Communion with God, therefore, is," according to Mr. Drummond, "a scientific necessity."

The spiritual organism cannot live upon its own resources, any more than the natural, and as the body

must take into itself and assimilate with itself, the food that lies outside of it, so must the soul absorb spiritual nutriment from without, in order to live. It finds its life in GOD and not in itself.

I must leave the chapter, entitled *Conformity to Type*, unnoticed, and pass on to what may be considered the most interesting portion of the volume, in which Mr. Drummond presents certain very original and suggestive views under the titles of *Semi-Parasitism* and *Parasitism*. These two chapters are scientific sermons, with the words of S. Paul for their text, "Work out your own salvation." He begins by saying :

Parasites are the paupers of nature. They are forms of life which will not take the trouble to find their own food, but borrow or steal it from the more industrious. Plants may become parasitic—it is an acquired habit—as well as animals. The Dodder, for instance, starts right, with roots of its own and everything else complete, but after a while it gets in the way of fastening its curious sucking discs into some adjoining tree and drawing all its supplies ready-made from the sap of its neighbor. Having no further need for organs of nutrition, nature takes them away, and in process of time the Dodder becomes a plant without a root, or twig, or leaf, and with a stem so useless as to be unable to bear its own weight.

Why does the naturalist think hardly of the parasites? His reply is brief—'Parasitism, he will say, is one of the greatest crimes in nature. It is a breach of the law of Evolution. Thou shalt evoke, thou shalt develop all thy faculties to the full, thou shalt attain to the highest conceivable perfection of thy race—and so perfect thy race—this is the first and greatest commandment of nature. But the parasite has no thought for its race, or for perfection in any shape or form. It wants two things—food and shelter. How it gets them is of no moment. Each member lives exclusively on its own account, an isolated, indolent, selfish, and backsliding life.'

It is very strange that nature should allow the existence of such miserable creatures as these, but she always avenges herself by the penalty which she inflicts upon the organism itself. The hermit crab, which is not, strictly speaking, a full blown parasite, but only steals the cast-off shell and makes that foreign shell its abode, with a view to protection,

Suffers in its own anatomical structure just by as much as it has borrowed from an external source. Its own shell deteriorates into a thin and delicate membrane, its fourth and fifth pair of limbs become small and useless, and it become utterly unfitted for the rough and adventurous life among the rocks and boulders, to which it was originally adapted.

This is an illustration of what the author calls semi-parasitism; the *unadulterated* parasite is seen in what naturalists call the *Sacculina*, a minute organism, looking like a kidney-bean, that is found within the body of the hermit-crab; which, as it has possession of another's dwelling, is in its turn preyed upon by a more avaricious intruder. In its final stage of retribution, the *Sacculina* is nothing but "a bunch of root-like processes hanging on the side of the crab, with their extremities ramifying in delicate films through the living tissues "of the poor creature from whom it derives its support."

When we inquire into the life history of this small creature, we unearth a career of degeneracy all but unparalleled in nature. When the embryo first makes its appearance it bears not the slightest resemblance to the adult animal. A different name even is given to it by the biologist, who knows it at this period as a *Nauplius*. This minute organism has an oval body supplied with six well-jointed feet by means of which it paddles briskly through the water. For a time it leads an active and independent life, industriously seeking its own food and escaping enemies by its own gallantry. But soon a change takes place. The hereditary taint of parasitism is in its blood, and it proceeds to adapt itself to the pauper habits of its race. The tiny body first doubles in upon itself, and from the two front limbs elongated filaments protrude. Its four hind limbs entirely disappear, and twelve short-forked swimming organs temporarily take their place. Thus strangely metamorphosed the *sacculina* sets out in search of a suitable host, and in an evil hour, by that fate which is always ready to accompany the transgressor, is thrown into the company of the hermit-crab. With its two filamentary processes—which afterward develop into the root-like organs—it penetrates the body; the sac-like form is gradually assumed; the whole of the swimming feet drop off—they will never be needed again—and the animal settles down for the rest of its life as a parasite.

All this illustrates what is called in spiritual things the process of backsliding.

The case of the Hermit-crab, who sought nothing but *safety* when he ensconced himself in the empty shell, and still expected to earn his own living, is used by Mr. Drummond to illustrate what he calls the "Parasitic Doctrine of Salvation." The position which he enforces is thus expressed,—“Any principle which secures the safety of the individual without personal effort or the vital exercise of faculty is disastrous to moral character.” He then goes on to sketch, in the most vivid manner, two of the leading types of the Parasitic Doctrine of Salvation; the first is the doctrine of the Church of Rome, and the second that represented by the narrower Evangelical Religion.

Roman Catholicism offers to the masses a molluscan shell. They have simply to shelter themselves within its pale, and they are ‘safe.’ But what is this ‘safe’? It is an external safety—the safety of an institution.

This meets the wants of a multitude of people, who do not care to exercise their own faculties in determining the truth, nor to be thrown upon their own resources in working out salvation.

He detects another sort of Parasitism in the instance of those who take shelter in a perverted doctrine of the Atonement.

It is put to the individual in the following syllogism—‘You believe CHRIST died for sinners; you are a sinner; therefore CHRIST died for you; *and hence you are saved.*’ Now what is this but another species of molluscan shell? Could any trap for a benighted soul be more ingeniously planned? The affinity between these two systems is very clearly exhibited; the great aim in both cases being ‘to get off.’ The Church in the one instance is a kind of conveyancing office where the transaction is duly concluded, each party accepting the other’s terms; in the other case, a species of sheep-pen where the flock awaits impatiently and indolently the final consummation. Generally the means are mistaken for the end, and the opening up of the possibility of spiritual growth becomes the signal to stop growing.

These cheap religions inevitably induce a cheap life. “Safety being guaranteed from the first, there remains nothing else to be done, and the character remains untouched by the moral aspects of the sacrifice of CHRIST.”

"If by salvation is meant, a trusting in CHRIST *in order to likeness to CHRIST*, in order to that holiness without which no man shall see the LORD, the parasite's hope is absolutely vain."

Under the head of Parasitism as illustrated in the instance of the *sacculina*, who depends upon another not only for his shelter and home, but also for his sustenance, Mr. Drummond announces the formula, that "any principle which secures food to the individual without the expenditure of work is injurious, and accompanied by the degeneration and loss of parts." After a brief sketch of the various ways in which the working of this principle is manifested in social life, he asserts that it is in the religious sphere that we discover the full extent of the ravages which the parasite habit can make on the souls of men. "Of the things in modern Christianity which minister most subtly and widely to this all but unnamed sin," he begins, singularly enough, with "going to church;" but, while he "exposes some secret abuses of this venerable system," the Church, it is to be understood that it is the abuses which are condemned, and not "the sacred institution itself that is in danger of being violated by the attack of an impious hand."

The mischief consists essentially in the deputy-work or deputy-worship inseparable from church or chapel ministrations. The officiating minister gets the benefit of the spiritual truths that he presents to his people, and also of the preparatory exercise by which the truth is attained.

He finds the truth, digests it, is nourished and enriched by it, before he offers it to his flock. To a large extent it will nourish and enrich in turn a number of his hearers. But still they will lack something. The faculty of selecting truth at first hand and appropriating it for one's self is a lawful possession to every Christian. He who abandons the personal search for truth, under whatever pretext, abandons truth.

Mr. Drummond finds a still more decided tendency to Parasitism, when the worship is made more prominent than the preaching, and especially when it is peculiarly attractive in its outward form.

The man who connects himself with a Church is 'surprised to find

how rich is the provision there for every part of his spiritual nature. Each service satisfies or surfeits. Twice, or even three times a week, this feast is spread before him. The thoughts are deeper than his own, the faith keener, the worship loftier, the whole ritual more reverent and splendid. What more natural than that he should gradually exchange his personal religion for that of the congregation? What more likely than that a public religion should by invisible stages supplant his individual faith? What more tempting than to give up private prayer for the easier worship of the liturgy, or of the Church? Our churches overflow with members who are mere consumers. Their interest in religion is purely parasitic. Their only spiritual exercise is the automatic one of imbibition, the clergyman being the faithful hermit-crab who is to be depended upon every Sunday for at least a week's supply.'

The author finds another form of Parasitism induced by certain abuses of *Systems of Theology*; what he calls "a propositional theology," "controlling the Church by traditional authority."

An infallible standard is a temptation to a mechanical faith. Infallibility always paralyses. It gives rest; but it is the rest of stagnation.

The book closes with a chapter under the head of classification, in which the distinction between morality and religion is illustrated by the crystal and the shell, one of which is the product of inorganic and the other of organic law. Both may be beautiful, but they belong to different worlds. "The Christian is one who has passed from death into life, or from the inorganic kingdom to the organic. He is capable therefore of indefinite development or evolution. Herbert Spencer tells us that "Evolution has an impassable limit." Mr. Drummond asserts that there is no such limit.

Christianity opens a way to a further development—a development apart from which the magnificent past of nature has been in vain. It satisfies the law of continuity. It guarantees the necessary conditions for carrying on the organism successfully, from stage to stage. It provides against the tendency to degeneration. And finally, instead of limiting the yearning hope of final perfection to the organisms of a future age—an age so remote that the hope for thousands of years must still be hopeless—instead of inflicting this cruelty on intelligences mature enough to know perfection and earnest enough to wish it, Christianity puts the prize within immediate reach of man.

I must here close my attempt to analyze this brilliant and suggestive work, which cannot fail to charm the reader by its singular beauty of diction, even though he may be led in some instances to question the accuracy of the author's statements and the logical applicableness of his illustrations to the doctrine which he aims to establish.

In the general review of Mr. Drummond's book, there are certain troublesome questions that suggest themselves, and which have not been in any way relieved or even alluded to by him. The leading thought of the book is, that, as physical life can only come of pre-existing life, so spiritual life cannot exist, except on the condition that a vital spiritual germ has been implanted in the soul. This is the author's logical conclusion from the general law of biogenesis, and it is not easy to see how it can be disputed. It is assumed however that this special gift has been conferred only upon a very limited portion of the human race, and there is no intimation of any process by which a human being, in the exercise of his normal or natural faculties, can secure the gift of spiritual life. He may lead the most irreproachable *moral* life, but that is only a natural life, and leaves him in a state of entire isolation, so far as anything like living, spiritual communion with God is concerned.

It may be that all which Mr. Drummond has really done is to present to the mind a series of striking analogies in the two worlds of nature and spirit, and perhaps the subject under consideration is of such a nature as to render any other style of treatment impracticable.

Since this paper was written I observe that the *Contemporary Review* describes the contents of Mr. Drummond's book as Christianized Pantheism, or rather, as Pantheized Christianity, and says that "fanciful analogies abound throughout the entire work." I do not see the force of this criticism, and if the author does *seem* to invest the parasites of nature with "intelligence, volition and even responsibility," it is only to make his illustrations more vivid, just as a writer of parables might personify the active forces of nature.

I have anticipated another point which is thus expressed in the Review:

The application of some of the author's theories to Christianity represents the future kingdom of GOD as confined within limits as narrow as the most pronounced Calvinism. According to him, the Elect will be a very little flock, in which we can find no place for the great luminaries of the heathen world; but he forbears to tell us what will be the fate of the numerous non-elect.

This is one of the most unsatisfactory features of the book, and the general impression that it leaves upon the mind is, that the same law of waste which we see in the natural world, prevails in the spiritual world, and as only one occasional blossom on the tree ripens into fruit, so only here and there can a human being be found, who will be rescued from extinction. The sharp line of distinction which the author draws between the moral and the spiritual life,—which, according to his showing, is as marked as that which separates the mineral and animal kingdom,—“the natural man,” let his moral development be never so complete, “being dead from the standpoint of Christianity,”—must of course limit the number of those who are to be regarded as “alive with God” to a very small minority.

There are persons so constituted, as to make the moral element in their characters, more prominent than the religious, as there are those who are susceptible of fervent religious emotion, while their moral qualities are somewhat deficient. It is hard to believe that the latter are destined to indefinite and eternal growth, and the former doomed to a gradual collapse of all their higher powers, and yet this is the logical conclusion from the writer's premises. Not that he undervalues in the least degree the beauty and value of morality, and he would probably allow that “the pure in heart *must* see GOD;” he might however assert that no man can be really pure, in whose soul the germ of a special and distinctive spiritual life has not been implanted by an Almighty hand. But, as I have already intimated, he fails to show how this peculiar gift can be secured by the man himself for, as he cannot grow by

any act of his own will, so of necessity, he cannot originate the life, in virtue of which he grows. This is the one painful defect in this remarkable book, and we cannot help wishing that the author had said something to relieve the difficulty

THOMAS M. CLARK.

FRAGMENTARY REMINISCENCES OF THE LATE BISHOP BOONE OF SHANGHAI.

THE commencement of our Mission to China illustrates how, almost invariably, great works have their origin, humanly speaking, in the thought—the heart's thought of one individual.

As far as our Church is concerned Augustus Lyde was the real originator of the movement, on the part of the youngest of the great nations, in sending the Gospel to the oldest and most numerous.

The little volume, *Buds of Spring*, edited by Dr. (now Bishop) Vail, and the memorial sermon of Bishop Stevens, furnish the material for this part of the history. Also there are some original letters among my papers, and the Rev. Dr. E. N. Cornwall had others. Bishop H. Potter, likewise, and Mrs. Brownell, had reminiscences of Lyde's student days.

From the parish register of S. James's, Wilmington, N. C., I copied the following record, which was in the handwriting of Dr. Empie :

"1813, June 20, Augustus Foster—son of George and Susan Lyde, born Feb. 4, 1813."

His letter to Edward Newton, showing the effect of personal and family kindness to a young student, and the lamentable want of advice and sympathy in a *Theological Seminary*, is one of the most distressing exhibitions of the evil of neglecting these institutions in the matter of missions.

His mother's letter to me gives some sweet reminiscences of his religious feelings at the age of thirteen.

[Here is a copy of the inscription on Lyde's tombstone in the churchyard of S. Peter's Philadelphia.]

Sacred
To the Memory
of the
REV. AUGUSTUS FOSTER LYDE,
A Deacon
of the Protestant Episcopal Church,
who was born in Wilmington, N. Carolina,
Feb. 4th, 1813,
and died in the City of Philadelphia,
Nov. 19th, 1834.

It was in his heart
to preach the Gospel to the Chinese,
and
For that service
He had offered himself to GOD and the Church,
But it pleased his Heavenly FATHER
To call him early home,
and he died
at XXI.
Patient, cheerful, victorious
Through the Faith
of the LORD JESUS CHRIST.

Concerning Messrs. Hanson and Lockwood, I remember Bishop Boone's speaking with much regard; but to the effect that neither of them were *adapted* for the *kind* of work required at that stage of the Mission, when great cheerfulness and elasticity were required to keep a new missionary to bear up against the very discouraging news *then* entertained as to the Chinese language. This subject is now much better understood; and the facilities for acquiring the language are so greatly increased that no one who can use his own tongue with ease need be afraid of not being able to use the Chinese with profit and satisfaction.

The lesson which their case seems to support is the importance of using all reasonable means for the ascertain-

ment of the *fitness* of missionary candidates, *before* they are appointed and sent abroad.

Twenty years later we had a Mission House at Philadelphia, where this ascertainment was attempted. How much of time, money, trouble, disappointment, and detriment generally, would have been saved, if earlier heed had been given to this matter.

It was brought before the Foreign Committee in 1842 when Dr. Cutler (then visiting Europe) was requested to look into the matter. On his return (as he told me himself) he reported *recommending the establishment of a Missionary College*. But neither then, nor when I myself brought the matter distinctly before them in 1853, nor indeed when Mr. Aner urged it vehemently in '62, were the authorities willing to move, or even to approve.

Theological Seminaries—as now conducted—do not meet the want; whether they might not do so if a missionary professorship were instituted in each, or else they were visited systematically by secretaries and returned missionaries, or were enlivened by an annual course of lectures on missions (after the manner of the Bampton Lectures), are questions well worth consideration. *Certainly*, it ought to be inculcated earnestly and thoroughly as those whose lot it may be to remain at home, that it devolves on them to sustain the Missions abroad, as part of their regular parochial work. Alas, that the present generation of our ministers has been allowed to grow up untaught and untrained on this point. Thirty years have passed, and nothing adequate has been *attempted* in the way of teaching the minds, and forming the habits of our two thousand parish ministers!

I had it from Mr. Jas. De Peysten that he was at the first *decidedly opposed* to Dr. Boone's going to China, but was greatly moved by his extreme earnestness and convinced by his arguments. I have understood that the letters which he addressed to the committee at that time and on that subject are very remarkable—they ought surely to be accessible to the Church.

It was intended, I believe, that he should be associated with Mr. Southgate, then engaged in his exploratory visit

to Mesopotamia; but his own convictions overruled the result, and brought others round to his way of thinking.

Bishop (then Mr.) Stevens visited China where Messrs. Hanson and Lockwood were then, and can supply information which, in connection with their letters, would illustrate this preliminary stage of difficulty and discouragement.

I distinctly remember that when Bishop Boone was recounting his experiences on Java, he almost invariably dwelt on the importance of *schools* to the permanency of missionary work, and often referred to the sorrowful testimony of a certain German missionary who mourned over the fact that he had omitted to give any attention to the school department of the work.

His own eagerness in learning the language must have been extreme; his application was certainly excessive. I have heard him recount how he would every night, immediately before getting into bed, take a last look at the Chinese characters he had been endeavoring to learn during the day; and the first thing in the morning, before he attended to anything else, he would rush to the table, and covering over the sounds, meanings, etc., fix his eye only upon the bare characters and try whether he could, by mere force of memory, recall them. The efforts which he then made and the fever from which he suffered, left an indelible impression on his head and nervous system. When at Amoy, the Bishop (as he would often tell us) had occasion to know that war did not shut a minister out of usefulness; on the contrary, he was sought for (as was Schwartz) to be a mediator between the military and the people, and often enjoyed the blessings of the peace-maker.

As an incident belonging to this period, and as an instance of the extreme demoralization of the Chinese in regard of licentiousness, he used to relate that when he and Mr. Abeel were living together at Amoy, a Chinese pander once approached them, offering to procure concubines for them both. Dr. Boone resented the suggestion as a white man should, and the Chinese expressed his surprise, which was somewhat modified, however,

when he learned that Dr. Boone was a *married* man; still he declared he must be a great "sage" a "holy" man—using the term applied to Confucius. But when he found that Dr. Abeel, though an *unmarried* man, was just as indignant as his friend, the Chinaman was perplexed beyond measure, and declared that Dr. Abeel "must be Buddha himself!"

Such is the habitual degradation of thought and feeling among a people where *books* praise continence.

Then came the death of Mrs. Boone and the return of the bereaved husband and motherless children to the United States; and then a long tour, in the course of which a great number of parishes were visited and pledges procured for the maintenance of one hundred boys and one hundred girls, who were to be supported and instructed, as had been done, on a smaller scale, previously at Batavia. It was calculated that a boy could be sustained for \$25 a year and a girl for \$20. Subsequent experience—perhaps from an increase in the cost of living—showed that \$5 should be added to these estimates.

Of the many incidents which must have occurred during this time Bishop Boone would often refer to the following:

A gentleman residing near New York had visited Amoy in the course of his travels, and gave it out, on his return, that "he had seen Dr. Boone at a boat race!" Dr. Boone, with that point and promptitude for which he was remarkable, requested the gentlemen to name time, place and circumstances. Whereupon, of course, the whole charge evaporated; as will almost all similar charges and discouraging reports made by returned travellers, if only the absent missionary's friend will stand by him, and ask the flippant defamer a few plain questions that will bring him to the point, and keep him there. Dr. Bridgman's memoir, and Mrs. Keith (p. 216), furnish good remarks on this subject.

Dining one day in company with Bishop O. (then of New York), some one present demurred seriously to Dr. Boone's "associating himself with Dissenters"—refer-

ring to the close intimacy that had existed between Dr. Abeel and himself. Dr. Boone replied warmly—"Sir, if any man loves the LORD JESUS enough to make him leave home and friends and country, to go and preach His name among the Gentiles, then *I love him* with both hands, and all my heart!" Those who remember his earnest manner of saying what he earnestly felt will readily believe that no more objection was made to such as Dr. Abeel at *that* dinner table.

As an instance of the advantage of our organization, making the Church's *recognized* duty, to sustain missions, and therefore gaining access to *all* parishes and dioceses for the agents of the Board, Bishop Boone used to refer to the handsome manner in which he was received by Bishop De Lancey, who was known from the first to be unfavorable to the undertaking of a Mission to China, by our Church, thinking it more suitable that the Church of England should take full charge of that field. The same might be said of Maryland whose Bishop (Whittingham) though a lover of missions, was not cordial towards this one.

It was in the course of this tour that Dr. Boone met with those who became his fellow laborers.. At Boston, Miss Morse; at New York, Miss Gillett; at Alexandria, Messrs. Woods, Graham and Syle; at Mobile, Miss Emma Jones. His second wife, sister of Bishop Elliott, was from Georgia; with all these (except Mr. Syle), he sailed in the "Horatio" after his consecration as Missionary Bishop.

With regard to the circumstance preceding that consecration, I remember his saying that he was careful to tell the assembled Bishops who were about to join in the ceremony that he must not be understood as promising to use, in his future field, *all* the Offices as they stand in the American Prayer Book; of course *nothing contrary* to it; but his own judgment must decide *how much* of the Litany should be used on given occasions.

This was for the relief of his conscience; and the necessity for such a course appeared when we were engaged in the translation of the Prayer Book, some years

after. It was at that time (if I remember rightly) that he particularly mentioned this circumstance, as his warrant for the freedom he felt in setting forth at first only a portion of the Morning Prayer for use among the Chinese.

Not very long after his consecration, the Bishop and all his party sailed from New York in the ship "Horatio," for Hong Kong. There they got passage in smaller vessels up the coast—only Miss Gillett remaining behind—or rather at Canton where, as Mrs. Bridgman, she lived some years. Her *sudden* withdrawal from the Mission was unhappy in one respect; it left the Bishop without the means of commencing the girls' school *at the same time* with that for the boys'; a consequence of which was that when the first set of pupils left the boys' school there were no girls who had enjoyed a Christian training to whom they could be betrothed. Consequently they married heathen wives, and (it might be said *consequently* also) they most of them, fell away from their Christian position, and profession, becoming a great discredit to our cause.

It would seem to be a true principle that no laborer who goes out as part of a mission should withdraw from his, or her, work until there has been time to get the position filled—unless the Bishop* should freely consent to their doing so. In Miss Gillett's case, the Bishop did consent; but it was made, by force of circumstances (voluntarily created) almost impossible for him to do anything else.

It was on the 19th of November, 1885 (the eleventh anniversary of Lyde's death), that I and my wife arrived at Shanghai; and then commenced that intimacy which lasted with such unbroken harmony and satisfaction for all the remainder of our dear Bishop's lifetime—even for nineteen long and eventful years. God be praised for His goodness in giving me so great a blessing as this long period of association with a man so gifted and so good, so considerate as a Bishop, so kind as a neighbor, so reliable as a friend, so brotherly as a Christian! And

it was a great addition of both comfort and blessing that our wives were like minded.

It had been given out, and even printed generally in newspapers, that our Mission "was to" consist (some had it, "*did* consist") of *ten* presbyters; and there were to be schools containing one hundred boys and one hundred girls.

On my arrival I found Mr. Woods and his wife sailing *down* the river, on their way home, as we were sailing *up*. There remained Mr. and Mrs. Graham, Miss E. Jones, and Miss Morse; these, with the Bishop and Mrs. Boone, were all domiciled in two Chinese houses on the line of street called *Wong-ka Mo-dur*. My journal, from this date onward contains an ample account of all our proceedings. I shall therefore restrict myself to such things as are supplementary; or as exhibit the Bishop's character and opinions. I do not know how he regarded this smallness of numbers compared with what was proposed and published—"a Bishop and *ten* presbyters" were said to have *gone out*! but I do know that on one occasion, when a very distressing outbreak had occurred in our midst, he said to me, with tears in his eyes, that he "had been at times disposed to *close up the whole matter* and return home." Even the utterance of such a thought was an extreme result in one of his hopeful and earnest temperament; and goes to show how severe are the trials which come from the apathy of friends at home, or the waywardness of fellow-laborers abroad.

An instance of the Bishop's clear-sightedness was seen in his course with regard to holding Sunday Services in the British Consulate. Major Balfour (the Consul) wished him to take charge of the arrangements, and invite all the missionaries to preach in turn—Churchmen and Dissenters without distinction. The Bishop said to the Consul that he himself and the clergy of his Mission would be ready to officiate on any specific occasion when the Consul might invite them *individually*. This arrangement, he felt sure, would be most satisfactory to all concerned. So it proved, and the Consulate Service was

attended by all until the building of the Trinity church began.

For some months, after our arrival, we took our meals at the Bishop's table, though we lodged elsewhere. Great was our enjoyment of his entertaining conversation, and many were the valuable remarks that fell from him at these times. I find it noted, as on the 23d of January, 1846, that he said he "felt convinced the best way to acquire the Chinese language was to go and live with a Chinese family." I felt at the time that this was true, and about four months later proposed to adopt this plan; but then (for some reasons I cannot recall) he dissuaded me from making the attempt; and still later, I think, he laid more stress on the desirableness of missionaries keeping together rather than scattering, unless it appeared their work would thereby be hindered.

On the occurrence of some little dissatisfaction expressed by one missionary as to certain payments expected from him by another, the Bishop remarked, "I never dispute an account with a brother missionary. I have paid some pretty severe bills in my time; but, upon principle, I have never disputed one."

This was entirely in keeping with his high-minded habit not only of acting, but of feeling, in regard to accounts. He was himself beautifully accurate—almost punctilious—in his book-keeping; it seemed to be part of his love of truth to make an account *appear* exactly as it *was*,—not tolerating slovenly estimates or "general averages,"—but he was generous and gentlemanly, liberal and considerate in the highest degree.

Bishop Boone felt a repugnance to the keeping of a private journal—why, I could never ascertain to my own satisfaction. His taste was revolted at the exhibitions of morbid feeling found in many religious biographies; but, after having for some time contended [with that mixture of pleasantry and disputation in which he often indulged] that the religious diaries were objectionable in *principle*, he yielded when it was urged that a large number of the Psalms of David were of this character. My own habit was exactly the reverse; this being one of the many

points of difference between us—but our differences never caused division.

It was during the month of February, 1847, that the attack was experienced which first disabled the Bishop from preaching. It would not be easy to express how great a grief this was to him; or how severe and continuous were the sufferings he underwent. I was present when the distressing operation of passing the seton-needle through the flesh at the back of the neck was performed; and subsequently, when two issues were established on the back. All these were, for months and years, kept open by irritating ointments and other appliances; and it should be borne in mind that it was with such "thorns in the flesh" that he prosecuted all his subsequent labors, translations, discussions, correspondence, oversight of schools, settlement of accounts, and all that is involved in such a work as his, in such a land as China.

Notwithstanding all this, he was one of the most cheerful Christians, one of the most enlivening companions, one of the most patient and equable of friends. I cannot recall a single occasion in which the intense nervous irritability from which he suffered caused him to say or do anything wounding to my feelings. His physical distress was oftentimes extreme, and could not be concealed; but it seemed as if it never occurred to him to be impatient, and his nervous condition never made him irritable towards his friends.*

His amiability, however, was not mere easiness of disposition, for he could be firm enough when occasion required. For instance, having determined that when we officiate in Chinese, only one sacred garment should be used, and that the surplice, which was ecclesiastical, rather than the gown, which was academic. He maintained the observance of his rule unflinchingly, although one of our English Church Missionary brethren refused to interchange on the ground of this being required.

*The nature of his ailments was such that he could never expect to be well as long as he continued to labor; and labor was his life—especially intellectual labor, which was especially injurious to his health. Thus it was that he toiled on; rejoicing evermore, especially when, as he remarked on Christmas Day, 1849, he felt "better than he ever expected to be in this life."

At the same time [June, 1847], he engaged in the establishment of an English Church, which he thought more likely to be sustained than any other kind; and though his own preferences were for its being on a Free Church basis, not "Free" as opposed to "Pew Renting," but as not being connected with the Establishment, either Scotch or English, yet, when it passed over into the hands of the British community exclusively, he acquiesced with all readiness, being content if the good work was only *done*, no matter who did it.

It was he who, in conjunction with the British Consul, Mr. [now Sir Rutherford] Alcock, set on foot Trinity Church, Shanghai, and it was he who years later at the request of the Trustees, preached the Funeral Sermon of their faithful chaplain, Rev. John Hobson.

His American feelings were not inert, but showed themselves now and then in an unequivocal way—especially in discussion; but, though sometimes sorely tempted in this respect, he kept national considerations entirely clear of religious undertakings.

His greatest trial on this point was with regard to the controversy which sprang up [commencing 15th July, 1847,] on the subject of the proper words in Chinese to be used as a translation of *Elohim* and *Theos* in the Bible. There was a strong disposition to make this an "English *versus* American" question; but the Bishop never yielded to this himself, or encouraged it in his countrymen. He exerted himself earnestly and laboriously in behalf of what he felt to be true principles of translation; and well would it have been if his views had prevailed! The extraordinary system—both mongrel and fanatical—of the Chinese Insurgents could never have become what it did but for the use of *Shang Te* in the translation of the Scriptures which fell into their hands.

Our Bishop's tenderness and consideration for those committed to his oversight were beautifully exhibited in the care he took of our good Brother Spalding, whose sudden failure of health, in the early part of 1849, disappointed so many hopes of his usefulness. He had come

out from home, apparently a strong, healthy, vigorous man. He had shown a child-like docility in the matter of learning the language; and his reward had been that, by following implicitly the Bishop's directions, he was able to speak in Chinese, so as to be usefully understood, many months sooner than any one else in all my observation. He had labored with great earnestness and success—so far as securing the love and confidence of those around him is to be counted as "success." He had by great perseverance, accomplished the purchase of a lot of ground nearly in the middle of the Chinese City, as a site for the church building; he had diligently preached and catechized, continuing his labors during the whole of Lent with unabated energy, though he observed the days of fasting with much vigor. The result foreseen and much lamented by his friends—especially by Mrs. S., who remonstrated with him on his extreme abstemiousness—was that his strength failed him; his general health gave way; and the lurking seeds of consumption were developed.

It was a sad office the Bishop had to perform when this was ascertained; and I shall never forget the emotion with which he visited our poor, enfeebled brother, and told him, "Spalding, you must go home!" I felt like one who stands by at the reading of a death-warrant; and Spalding himself burst into tears, such as are shed by those who realize the final disappointment of their cherished hopes. *These* are the trials of a missionary's life—to send others, or to go away one's self, from the field where there is so much to attach, so much to be performed!

On such occasions, our dear Bishop's affectionate nature and friendly consideration showed themselves in an eminent degree. Every reasonable provision was made; and, so far as circumstances permitted, a most liberal scale of preparation was adopted in the case of returning missionaries, of whom it was his regretful experience to send home a large number—a much larger number than would have been necessary had greater pains been taken to ascertain the *adaptation* of candidates for missionary

appointments *previous* to their being sent out from home.

Another way in which his kindness and consideration exhibited themselves was in the treatment of our early converts, in whose behalf he always resisted the tendency to set up separate services for themselves, on the part of the missionaries. Such of the Chinese as could speak English, though it might be imperfectly, were always expected to be present at the weekly prayer meetings, which were held on Thursday evenings, in the Bishop's own parlor; he *made a point* of this, as also he did of having *all* connected with our Mission unite in the celebration of the Holy Communion in *the Chinese language*, though some of the missionaries were disposed to demur to this, as impairing their own comfort and profit in the service. Occasionally, but not often, he would administer in the English language; but he was *jealous* of anything that would make our Chinese fellow-Christians feel that there was any "wall of partition" between them and their teachers, and repressed everything that tended towards the creation of a *caste* feeling. From this, as an *institution*, we are happily entirely free in China; but the notion, "I am better than thou," is one that will be found to influence people, under every imaginable variety of circumstances.

The tendency to denationalize the Chinese who became Christians was another thing which our Bishop always resisted. He carefully discriminated between what was and what was not, essentially Christian in our observances; and laid great stress upon the former, while in regard to the latter, he adapted our usages to Chinese arrangements. For instance, as in the above case, he insisted upon a *united* participation in the Eucharist, whilst he followed the Chinese (which is the lunar) reckoning of the months; so that our Communion day was always the Sunday after each full moon.

Another feature, well worth noting, was the Bishop's fidelity, as well as kindness, to his friends. He told them with all candor and plainness, when he saw that in them which he judged to be mistaken or injurious. I can recall instances, in my own case, in which he pointed out

features in my preaching, both in Chinese and English, which he did not like; and also, especially on one occasion, a remonstrance to me concerning the training of my oldest boy, Henry, for whom he had stood sponsor. Others of the missionaries under his charge would testify that he was ready to reprove, rebuke and exhort—not so much, however, “with authority,” as with earnestness.

The beginning of the year 1850 was a cheerful epoch in our Mission. The Church—just finished—had been consecrated on Epiphany Sunday; the Revised Version of the New Testament had been published, and a candidate for the ministry was waiting to be ordained.

It was on the 10th of January, at the Thursday evening meetings which were held in his own parlor, that the Bishop commenced a series of exceedingly interesting and profitable lectures on the Divine Attributes. His especial clearness of thought and fertility of illustration, his readiness of expression and cogency of argument, here displayed themselves in an admirable manner—instructive, impressive, and elevating.

Easter Day, 20th of April, 1851.—“In the evening the Bishop took the service and gave us a very elaborate lecture on the Evidences of the fact of the Resurrection.”

20th. “Bishop continued lectures on the Catechism, Character of Creed.”

This last was a favorite topic, as bringing out the *historical* character of the true religion and refraining from points of doubtfulness. He also delighted in the wise simplicity of the first question in the Catechism, contrasting it with such unchildlike questionings as “What is the chief end of man?”

It is a great misapprehension to suppose that a missionary can afford to neglect the culture of the mind, or that he must needs sink down to the level of the heathen around him. On the contrary, he is bound to do all he can to counteract the tendency to “run down” generally, by maintaining habits of study; by “giving attention to reading,” and by maintaining literary and intellectual intercourse with those around. The Bishop well under-

stood this; and he thought it to be a good expenditure of certain sums of money, entrusted to his discretionary use by confiding friends, to procure a good Mission Library of Standard Theological and other works; so that through his judicious foresight, we had for perusal and reference a far better library than falls to the lot of most parochial clergymen. Add to this a monthly meeting for Conference among all the Protestant missionaries, and another opportunity of frequent recurrence, of meeting residents and visitors of literary and scientific culture, at the North-China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society; and it will be understood that the vocation of a missionary does not always involve a seclusion from "all the cultured joys, conveniences and delicate delights of ripe society." Although these are to be cheerfully resigned, if need so be.

Under date of 15th Jan., 1850, I find—"Through me, the Bishop, sent *Soo dong* \$20, to clear himself from debt to others." This was one among many instances of his readiness to help our poorer Chinese neighbors or converts; and that in spite of the jeers of many who did not think well of Miss T.'s efforts, and delighted to call our poor converts "Rice Christians." The Bishop once declared emphatically—"I am willing to have the finger of scorn pointed at me as the man who is kind to the Chinese; and I am not afraid of the effect of treating them with love and consideration."

And this was a season which called for all the love and consideration that could be shown; for a famine had brought around us thousands of poor, houseless, and half-naked sufferers to whom the missionaries ministered both by a teaching of truth and the distribution of food. This latter they were enabled to do by the liberal subscriptions of the foreign community; and the Bishop (as may well be believed) gladly took his share in these unaccustomed labors. Unaccustomed, yet far more congenial than the unwelcome controversy which he was obliged to maintain in an elaborate correspondence with the Bible Societies in London and New York.

The question had now assumed this practical form—

"With what word, as a translation of *Theos* shall the New Testament be *printed*?" and this the societies must needs meet. The Bishop made to them his last, and most masterly appeals on this subject; and his letters—to those who will study and can appreciate them—remain a monument of simplicity, force and clearness. To use the words of Dr. S. Wells Williams*—"They have not been improved or invalidated by any writer who has followed him. Bishop Boone's two essays contain the whole gist of the argument, and stand the test of the sharpest criticism." Yet all this while he was suffering—suffering acutely and continually. My journal, at about this period, is full of memoranda noting the occasions upon which he was so entirely disabled from conducting services that I was called on to officiate in his place, both in Chinese and English.

On one occasion [15 Feb.], I tried to relieve him by writing, from his dictation, the analysis of a certain tangled document which required a reply from him; but the experiment was not repeated. I think there was so much complication, and critical reference, that it was not easy to employ the pen of another in such work; to say nothing of the temptation to indulge in friendly discussions, of which if *his* part could have been stenographed, it would have equalled in point and brilliancy the table-talk of Archbishop Whately himself.

It was more possible to assist him by copying letters, etc., which I did largely about this time—not begrudging the labor because it brought me into closer communion with one of the finest minds I have ever known; though, at the same time, we all—our Bishop not the least—felt that it was a grievous burden laid on us to be contending about the first principles of translation with those whose prepossessions made it impossible to convince them.

Not only were letters written, but repeated conferences were held between the non-concurring translators [all but one of whom are now in their graves], and these exciting interviews were even more injurious to the Bishop's health than the irksomeness of writing; but he was set

* Recently deceased, to our great loss !

for the maintenance of what he felt to be important truth, and acted in this matter on a principle he often quoted—"The duties of life are more than life."

6 March, 1850. During the famine which succeeded the flood, the Bishop took his part in distributing rice-tickets to the starving poor who came into Shanghai from the surrounding region. In doing this [which was anything but an easy task], he exhibited that blending of the exactest order with the greatest *bonhomie*, by which he was always characterized. Not exactly following the Scripture methods of making them sit down "by fifties and hundreds," he nevertheless made the multitudes arrange themselves along the fence which enclosed our Mission buildings; and even so, it needed the presence of a number of our servants, as a police force, to prevent those who had first received their tickets from running round and presenting their claims a second time. Such attempts [which would have made some missionaries angry] only caused the Bishop to smile, though with some sadness at the thought of the suffering and destitution which drove the applicants to such poor devices.

Here it might suitably be mentioned that the Bishop was never to be frightened off from giving assistance to the poor heathen, when they were in need, and it was in the power of his hand to help them, by the fear that they might profess themselves thus from mercenary motives. He would refer to the fact that our SAVIOUR *did* feed the multitudes that followed Him, although He reproved them for seeking Him because of the loaves rather than because of the miracles He did. The epithet of "rice-Christians," was transferred from Hindoostan and was often applied, to our poor Chinese converts, by those who are sceptical as to the existence of *any* honesty among the unevangelized heathen; and the Missionaries who think well of any of them are looked upon as weak-minded men—"amiable enthusiasts," if you please. Our Bishop's reply in such cases was, "I am not afraid of the effect of treating them with compassion, and alleviating their temporal miseries."

In affording relief, the Bishop's idea was that in most

cases a prompt and generous assistance, "once for all," as it were, was better than doing in dribblets whatever might be intended. I have known him give, or lend, a goodly number of dollars to clear a man from embarrassment and set him on his feet again, with a cheerful feeling about making a fresh start and taking care of himself. But at the same time, he always had his list of poor pensioners—regular dependents upon his purse; widows, or aged, or decrepit, who had established some permanent claim upon his sympathies.

This prompt and large-hearted way of doing things was characteristic. He despised paltering in any form, or on any subject. From the great Mission work itself down to the timely present for a little day-school pupil, he had a generous, joyful manner of doing his part; and this was contagious wherever his presence was felt. Even his letters made the same impression, and often led people to engage in enterprises, noble and animating as *he* presented them; but, alas, how often was he disappointed, when he found the warm friends of the moment losing their ardor, and almost their consistency, when no longer under his *personal* influence!

26 March, 1850.

At a meeting held on this date of all the Missionaries at Shanghai connected with the Revision of the Scriptures, a resolution was passed recommending the employment of a "plain and simple style" of translation, as opposed to the terse and old classic style so much admired by native scholars and by some Missionaries. Bishop Boone's judgment leaned decidedly to the "plain and simple style," and he often referred to the Philosophical Writings of *Choo Foo-tsz*, the famous Commentator, as the best model, pointing out how almost colloquial were many of his expressions, and remarking on the fact that, like Plato, he had found *Dialogue* the most convenient form for the expression of his ideas, some of which are of a very subtle and discriminating character.

In writings of this kind the Bishop took especial pleasure; delighting more, perhaps, in Mencius than in any

other author. His own mind had strong congeniality with that of this acute and elevated thinker; and I have often heard him express high admiration of the "loyalty," as he called it, with which Mencius adhered to the goodness and justice of Teën [Heaven] in spite of all the conflicting phenomena of life which seemed inconsistent with it. He said it was among the noblest efforts of the human soul, unaided by revelation.

Sometimes, indeed, when he was translating and illustrating some terse utterance of this favorite author, he would seem to give him credit for more perception than he deserved: and I well remember, on one occasion, exclaiming, at the conclusion of one of those brilliant dissertations: "It's all very beautiful, Bishop; but I can't say I see it in the text; you are doing Mencius overmuch honor in so explaining him." The Bishop thought not; it was all there *in principle*, he said. And so it might have been, for it was one of the Bishop's characteristics to perceive clearly the *tendencies* of things, and to regulate his expectations more by what he felt sure would result from the *principles* which were involved in any movement, than by any outward prospect of success or failure.

It was in this way that he predicted so sagaciously the course of the Chinese Insurgents, and the failure of their attempt. His remark was, as nearly as I can recall it: "As soon as I learned that *Hung Siu Tseun* claimed to be one of the persons of the Trinity, and that he enjoined polygamy and put forth the Ten Commandments on his *own* authority, I knew no good could come of the movement. God would never bless such a system." Subsequent developments have proved that this estimate was entirely correct.

This clearness of perception, together with the equal clearness of his argumentation in proving the point he undertook to sustain, operated sometimes in a singular manner on the minds of others, especially if they were engaged in some common work with him, but had not altogether adopted his views. At such times he would show such earnestness and cogency in argument as alto-

gether to convince his collaborators at the moment, so that they were ready to carry out the plans he indicated. Afterwards, however, when no longer under the immediate influence of his presence, they were apt to experience a subsidence of interest—almost a recoil from that to which they themselves assented—so that the Bishop found himself left to sustain alone what he advocated, if indeed he did not encounter opposition from those whom he had once convinced.

6 April, 1850.

"Bishop troubled" is a brief entry I found in my journal, and it is so unusual that I must explain the cause of it—no letter from the Secretary. Commonly he bore up under such disappointments [they were not infrequent] with cheerfulness; but they nevertheless added not a little to his burden. Whenever the Foreign Committee was found fault with by myself or any other member of the Mission, the Bishop was their valiant defender—all the more so, we sometimes thought, because he seemed to feel that if any one had any right to find fault with them it was himself. But that he seldom allowed himself to do; in this matter there was a vein of magnanimity such as ran through all his dealings with others. Whether at this time it was the non-appearance of reënforcements or the tardy remittance of funds that troubled him, we of course could not tell, for he kept those matters to himself; but we saw how such things tended to oppress and exhaust his nervous energies, and we felt how cruel a thing it was to place a man in his responsible position, to sanction his plans and efforts upon a given scale, and then not furnish the men and means for carrying them out effectively, but to let the work languish so that its opponents cried out: "A failure—a failure!" Failure there was, but it was chiefly in not sending out reënforcements.

11 April, 1850.

"With Bishop revising Acts." The many hours spent in the Bishop's study while engaged in revising with him our Dialect Versions of the SS. were occasions of much.

interest and profit. In one respect he was very especially adapted to be a translator of the Bible and a composer of Tracts—namely, in his quick perception of the immense influence of a happy or unhappy rendering of principal terms. He had a full acquaintance with the heresies of past times, so as to be aware what perversions needed to be guarded against; and at the same time he possessed a remarkable sagacity in discerning how far certain Chinese terms were likely to foster or to counteract old-time errors—such as Gnosticism, Arianism, and Sabellianism—all of which began to develop themselves among the Chinese converts, and in some cases [sad as the acknowledgment is] to be tolerated inadvertently by some self-instructed Missionaries. The Bishop prepared a communication to the American Tract Society, urging a Revision of their publications in Chinese, particularly with a view to the *very best* terms for such important ideas as *faith, righteousness, justification, etc.*

His forebodings as to the effect of the use of the term *Shang Te*, in the place of *God*, was justified by the event. The *Shangteism* of the Insurgents was thoroughly Arian in its theological aspects, while the general system into which it crystallized resembled both Mohammedanism and Mormonism—these results being largely fostered by the peculiar associations connected with terms common to the Scriptures (as translated by Dr. Gutzlaff) and the pluri-theistic Chinese Classics.

[It is more easy to pause abruptly than to attempt an expression of the thoughts and feelings which the perusal of these notes occasions. After enjoying a personal acquaintance with D. Wilson, Bishop McIlvaine, Dr. Sparrow, Bishop Hinds, Archbishop Whately, and others who, being not alive, I may not mention, I do not hesitate to rank our Bishop Boone as the peer of any of them.

EDWARD W. SYLE.

MONSIGNOR CAPEL.

Catholic; An Essential and Exclusive Attribute of the True Church. By Right Rev. Monsignor CAPEL, D.D., Domestic Prelate of His Holiness, Leo XIII., happily reigning Member of the Roman Congregation of the Segnatura, Priest of the Archdiocese of Westminster. New York: Wilcox & O'Donnell & Co.

ANYBODY who reads Monsignor Capel's little treatise on the word "CATHOLIC" as "*An Essential and Exclusive Attribute of the True Church*," hoping to find therein anything very new or interesting, will be disappointed. Never was so large a newspaper notoriety raised on a smaller capital of theology or real controversial skill. And if memory is correct, Monsignor's chief triumphs have been won in drawing-room campaigns with notables of society having more money than brains, rather than in conflicts with theologians and scholars. And this publication tells us the reason why.

Monsignor has been complimented for the *amiability* of this attack upon us. And in his *Preface* he gives us a taste of his quality. He quotes from S. Cyprian the following (which can have no appropriateness unless it be meant to describe *our* position): "Whoever parts company with the Church and *joins himself to an adulteress*, is estranged from the promises of the Church. He who leaves the Church of CHRIST, attains not CHRIST's rewards. He is an *alien*, an *outcast*, an *enemy*. He can no longer have GOD for a Father who has not the Church for a Mother." And immediately after thus (impliedly) telling us that we are *not* the children of GOD, but are aliens, outcasts, enemies, and joined to an adulteress, he wipes his mouth with benevolent serenity, and amiably adds: "*Calm, honest investigation of the matter cannot be other than an olive branch of peace*, leading prayerful, earnest souls into the Ark of Salvation." That sort of amiability, we can assure Monsignor, is far more amus-

ing than impressive, and we shall find plenty more of the same sort before we get through.

One of the drollest bits of shallowness in the whole *brochure* is his reprinting, at the end, three extracts from the Fathers—S. Cyprian's treatise on *The Unity of the Church*, one of the Catechetical Instructions of S. Cyril of Jerusalem, and a letter of S. Pacian. His reason for this is thus stated: "It is thought these treatises, of a dogmatic nature, representing Africa, Asia Minor [*is* Jerusalem in "Asia Minor?"]. Western Europe, and emanating from Saint Bishops of the 'Undivided Church,' will prove to be voices to which a deaf ear will not be turned. The Oxford translations have for obvious reasons been selected." Now here is richness! Those three patristic treatises are reprinted confessedly from translations made and published by Anglican Churchmen, nearly half a century ago;—treatises, every word of which is accepted by Anglican Churchmen;—treatises in which there is *not one syllable* of the modern Papal theory! And studying *these*—with which we have been perfectly familiar time out of mind—is to make us swallow modern Romanism, including the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and the Infallibility of the Pope as defined by the Vatican Council of 1870! But we beg pardon, we have not enumerated *all* his authorities. He also adds,—the only thing reprinted besides those three Fathers,—what do you think? An extract, not from another saint, or from a decree of a council, or from a bull of a Pope, or even from any divine of well-known character, but, for all the world, from—Lord Macaulay! Monsignor gives us the famous passage in which the future New Zealander is imagined as standing "on a broken arch of London Bridge to sketch the ruins of S. Paul's." And the study of this specimen of glittering rhetoric (in the course of which Macaulay says, of the Church of Rome, that "among the contrivances which have been devised for *deceiving* and *oppressing* mankind, it occupies *the highest place*"), the study of *this* is to make up for what is lacking in S. Cyprian, S. Cyril, and S. Pacian, and convert *us* into

modern Ultramontane Romanists! Really, is Monsignor himself an idiot? Or does he only take for granted, with his usual amiability, that *we* are all idiots?

But we have not yet done with this wonderful *Preface*. The extract from S. Cyprian, which is intended to show *us* the dangers of *our* assumed separation from the Church, includes the phrase: "Break a branch from the tree, once broken *it can bud no more*; cut the stream from its fountain, the remnant will be dried up." On the same page he says, that "The Protestant Episcopal Church" in the United States was "created in the year 1789." On page 67 he says, more correctly, that our Church "is *daughter* of the Church established by law in England." Parents do not usually "*create*" their "daughters." But the drollery comes in when we contemplate this "daughter" as a proof that the Church of England is "a branch broken from the tree," for that "once broken *it can bud no more*." A "bud" which, in less than a century after its first organization, numbers an Episcopate of sixty-eight, shows that the power of "*budding*," at any rate, still remains. Nor is this all; for within the same period, the Colonial Episcopate of the English Church has grown from *nothing* to more than *seventy*. And the Home Episcopate has also been increased, in England, to say nothing of beneficial changes in Ireland and Scotland; while the wonderful Revival of the Church, in principles and in practice, during the past half century, with the marvellous increase of devotion, earnestness and zeal, and the free expenditure of millions on churches, Church charities, and Church schools, all taken together, forms a total that can be exceeded nowhere in the history of the Church for fifteen hundred years past. To face this astonishing growth with the assertion, that being "once broken, it *can bud no more*," that being cut off from the fountain, its "remnant" is "*dried up*:" this is probably the most characteristic exercise of Monsignor's logical power, and the most splendidly ludicrous! But we shall find others like it.

The *Preface* is only two pages long, and we have not

done with it yet. The chief effort of Monsignor, in his whole work, is to demolish what is known as *The Branch Theory*. According to modern Roman doctrine, there is only one Branch, and that is Peter's; or rather Peter's Branch is, in itself and by itself, the *entire Vine*. Take, for instance, his title, "'CATHOLIC:' *An Essential and Exclusive Attribute of the True Church*," and add the words, "*in all its Branches*," and it would express *our* doctrine exactly. Now the amusing thing is, that so thoroughly does our Branch theory pervade all Christian Antiquity, that Monsignor can hardly make a quotation that does not go against himself. Every time he opens his mouth, he "puts his foot in it." That same fatal extract from S. Cyprian, which has brought him to grief already in other ways, contradicts him point blank on his main issue. It thus begins:

The Church is likewise one, though she be spread abroad, and multiplies with the increase of her progeny; even as the sun has rays many, yet one light; and the tree *boughs many*, yet its strength is one seated in the deep-lodged root; * * she stretches forth *her branches* over the universal earth, in the riches of plenty, etc.

Here is the *Branch* theory, word and thing. It is exactly the doctrine *we* hold and teach on that subject. S. Cyprian slaps Monsignor in the face with it before he has quoted three lines! And yet Monsignor quotes it to *us*, to induce *us* to abandon that very Branch theory which it embodies! We suppose that it is only his "amiability" once more at its old tricks!

To pass now from the Preface to the body of the work, it may be best to take up the very point upon which we have just touched. Our teaching is based upon the words of our LORD Himself, when He said: "I am the Vine, *ye* are the branches." Here *all* the Apostles, equally, are styled *branches*. Judas was amongst them. He was a branch which did not "abide" in the Vine, and was on the point of being broken off: yet when the words were spoken, he was a branch. The Roman theory would be correctly expressed, if our LORD had said: "I am the Vine, and *Peter* is the only Branch." Again, our LORD said: "Now *ye* are clean, through the word

which I have spoken unto you." The Roman theory is that to Peter only has been committed the Divine power of teaching the Church in all things that have to do with faith and morals. This would have been correctly expressed, had our LORD said: "Ye shall be clean, through the word which *Peter* shall speak unto you." Our LORD said: "He that abideth in Me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit; for without Me ye can do nothing." To express the modern Roman theory, He should have said: "He that abideth in *Peter*, and *Peter* in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit; for without *Peter* ye can do nothing." Our LORD said: "If a man abide not in Me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered." To convey the modern Roman gloss, He should have said: "If a man abide not in *Peter*, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered." These changed phrases would, we say, correctly express the modern Roman theory; yet our LORD never said anything of the sort. And even if He had uttered the changed phrases, it would remain to be proved that, when He said "Peter" He meant "the Pope of Rome;" and *that* could never be proved so long as the world turns round.

Now this modern Roman theory is so totally at variance with Scripture and antiquity, that Monsignor is perpetually cutting his own throat, with a happy unconsciousness that is irresistibly amusing. To point out all the cases of this would be too tedious. We will only give a few as samples.

He quotes S. Paul; * "God indeed hath set some in the Church, first *Apostles*, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers," etc. According to the modern Roman theory, He should have said, "*first, the Pope, secondly Bishops,*" etc. It is inconceivable that any modern Romanist should enumerate the officers in the Body of CHRIST, and *omit the Pope altogether*. Yet here S. Paul puts "Apostles" first—precisely in accordance with the Anglican theory,—all Bishops being on an equality.

Again, he quotes S. Paul, enumerating the several

* Monsignor uses his own version of Holy Scripture. We quote from him.

parts of the organism: "And some He gave to be *Apostles*, and some prophets, and others evangelists, and others pastors and teachers." Here we have the same old Anglican doctrine again, in all its purity. "Apostles"—in the plural—are first, and there is not a word about any Pope of Rome. Monsignor continues:

He specifies the purpose for which the power is conferred: 1. 'For the perfecting of the saints,' 2. 'for the work of the ministry,' 3. 'for the edifying (*i.e.* building up) of the *Body* of CHRIST.' And this is to be continued 'till we all meet in the unity of faith and of the knowledge of the SON of GOD, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the age of the fulness of CHRIST,' in order that we may not be 'Children tossed to and fro, and carried about by every wind of doctrine, in the wickedness of men, in craftiness by which they lie in wait to deceive.'

All this is pure Anglican doctrine. It shows that all these objects, "the perfecting of the saints," the "work of the ministry," the "edifying of the *Body* of CHRIST," till we all come to "the perfect man," may be secured by having "Apostles" at our head, and without one single special function reserved to the Pope of Rome.

Again (after some digression concerning Peter as the Rock, to which we shall return presently), Monsignor, speaking of the Twelve, says:

To these teachers [mark the plural number throughout] did JESUS, before ascending to Heaven, make known the whole of that doctrine which He had received of His Father, and in doing this He *completed* and *closed* the Revelation made to man. He made the Apostles participators in His power of signs and wonders; coöperators with Him in pardoning sin by Baptism, and the sacrament of reconciliation; to them He imparted the power to consecrate: 'Do this in commemoration of Me.' And as the Father had sent Him, so did he send them to preach His Gospel. This '*Ecclesia Docens*,' or Teaching Body, was thus fitted with Divine powers for the Ministry of the Gospel, and was duly commissioned by Divine authority to 'go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.'

Now this is good solid Anglican doctrine throughout—every word of it! It speaks of the *Apostles collectively*.

It does *not* speak a syllable concerning the Pope of Rome as the "Vicar of CHRIST."

When Monsignor treats of the Office and work of the HOLY GHOST, he is equally sound, and runs on for some seven pages with pure Anglican doctrine, showing that CHRIST made the promise to the Apostles [plural throughout], of the Comforter who was to abide with *them*, be in *them*, teach *them*, etc., and that on the day of Pentecost the cloven tongues sat upon *each* of them, and they were *all* filled with the HOLY GHOST. As to the power of mission,—“how can they preach unless they be sent?”—the Monsignor gives the correct Anglican answer:

As the Father sent the Son to preach the Gospel, so did the Son send the *Apostles*; *they* in turn sent others, bishops and priests and deacons, commissioned with *the same Divine authority* to preach and fulfil the Ministry. Accordingly S. John, speaking of himself and other pastors, could say: “We are of GOD; he that knoweth GOD heareth *us*: he that is not of GOD heareth not *us*: in this we know the Spirit of truth and the Spirit of error.”

There is not, in all this, a single lisp of the modern Roman doctrine, which would require: “He that knoweth GOD, heareth the Pope of Rome; he that is not of GOD, heareth not the Pope; in *this* we know the spirit of truth and the spirit of error.” With equal fidelity to Anglican doctrine, and with an equal ignoring of the Roman, Monsignor adds: “And *the Apostles*, acting in their *corporate capacity*, could proclaim their decree in the name of *themselves* and of the HOLY GHOST.” This is pure Anglicanism. How does it agree with the Vatican decree of 1870?—which says *not one word* about the Apostles in their corporate capacity, but reads thus:

We teach and define that it is a dogma Divinely revealed, that the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks *ex Cathedra*, that is, when discharging the office of Pastor and Doctor of all Christians, by virtue of his Supreme Apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine regarding faith or morals to be held by the Church Universal, by the Divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter, is possessed of that infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer willed that His Church should be endowed for defining doctrine concerning faith or morals; and that, therefore,

such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irreformable of themselves, and not from the consent of the Church. But if any one—which God avert—presume to contradict this our definition, let him be anathema.

There is nothing like *this* in all Monsignor's little book. He pours out page after page of pure Anglicanism, apparently unconscious that he is sawing off the limb betwixt himself and the tree all the while—demolishing effectually the very principles on which modern Romanism is compelled to depend. As to ordination, he does not make its validity dependent upon the Pope at all. He says:

The 'imposition of hands' is the Sacrament of Orders, and in common with the other sacraments, its effect is conferred *direct* by God. For this reason, could S. Paul write to Timothy: 'I admonish thee that thou stir up the grace of God which is in thee by the *imposition of hands*.' But the 'Commission,' or 'being sent,' is derived direct from the *Apostles*. It specifies where, how, and when the Divine authority is to be exercised by the individual pastor. 'For this cause,' writes S. Paul to Titus, 'I left thee at Crete, that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting, and shouldst ordain priests in every city, as I also appointed thee.' These two powers are distinguished as the power of Order, the power of Jurisdiction. Both are of God: the one comes direct through the Sacrament of Orders; the other indirectly from God through the Church by appointment. In the early Church they were often conferred simultaneously; still they were looked upon as distinct operations. * * The first coming directly from CHRIST is abiding, unchangeable, and is conferred in equal measure on each priest or bishop. The second not coming immediately, but through the Church from CHRIST to individuals, is conveyed in varying proportions, as may be deemed expedient for the good of souls. In the instances mentioned above, Timothy and Titus had neither more nor less of Episcopal character than had any of the Apostles; as Bishops they were equal. But the Apostles had universal jurisdiction directly from CHRIST. Timothy and Titus received their commission from the Apostles, etc.

Now all this is pure Anglican doctrine. There is not a syllable of Romanism in it. So again, as to teaching, and the power to decide controversies, Monsignor covers our ground with perfect accuracy. In the controversy which caused the meeting of the first Apostolic

Council, he does not pretend that Peter alone summoned that council, and formulated its decree. He says, correctly, "The Apostles and ancients came together to consider of this matter." And as to the result, it was not Peter who set forth his decree "irreformable by the Church:" but the decision ran in the name of them all: "It hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost *and to us.*" And this was done, "not by wisdom of the Apostles, but by the influence of the Holy Ghost whom they declared to be *with them.* And so it has ever been." All this is Anglicanism pure and simple. And we could quote whole pages of it besides, until our readers should be weary.

But here and there—as if stuck on from the outside, with a pin—Monsignor inserts phrases implying the modern Roman doctrine, though never stopping for a moment even to attempt to harmonize them with the Anglican doctrine which fills so much of his Part I., and the *whole* of his Part II. (always excepting Macaulay). He reminds us of a description we once heard, of a man who had a brain separated into non-communicating departments by water-tight bulkheads. Tap him in one place, you get pure Anglicanism; tap him in another place, you get pure Romanism. It would be an easy and rather comical way of trying to make Monsignor's work homogeneous, if some one would re-edit his little pamphlet, pulling out the pins, and taking off the queer patches of popery, throwing the parts about the English Church and our own into the waste-basket, and dropping Lord Macaulay from the tail of the work. Its Part I. and Part II. would then be in perfect harmony. The new edition might be entitled: "Anglicanism and Primitive Catholicity identical; being extracts from the pamphlet of Monsignor Capel and from three of the Ancient Fathers selected by him."

But Monsignor does not seem to be troubled in the least by his radical inconsistencies of statement. He goes on as smilingly and as unconcernedly as if his propositions were not mutually destructive. In one place, for instance, he is speaking of the present holders of

High Church teaching among us, and says, of them, "*Many of whom are now validly baptized.*" The reference is to some few cranks who are supposed to have been rebaptized by members of the Corporate Reunion or some such organization, which is a secret society, and of its acts or even its existence *nothing* is certainly known. The innuendo is, that these alone, of all the Anglican communion, are validly baptized. Now the doctrine of the Roman Church is, that any baptism is valid, which is given with water (even one drop will suffice), in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the HOLY GHOST, and with the intention to do what the Church does, though the baptizer be a layman, a woman, a schismatic, a heretic, or even a Jew. And yet—by sly innuendo—Monsignor would create the impression that only a few persons among the many millions of Anglicans are "validly baptized!" while in another place (p. 88), in his closing appeal to us to join the Church of Rome, he says: "*She is the Church of your baptism, to whom you owe allegiance and obedience; for the saving waters of regeneration are the portal to but one Church. They made you not members of Protestantism, but children of the Church of GOD.*" This presupposes *all* our Baptisms to be *valid*! Which of the two does our amiable Monsignor really mean?

Again, speaking of Orders, he says that "its effect is conferred direct by GOD;" it comes "*directly from CHRIST,*" "*is abiding, unchangeable,* and is conferred in equal measure on each priest or bishop." And in another place he says (p. 69): "*Admit the validity of the Orders,* whence does the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States derive its *mission* and jurisdiction?" this mission being the very thing which he had previously declared to be given "direct by GOD," and to be "abiding, unchangeable, and conferred in equal measure on each priest or bishop." Does he suppose that a thing which is given "direct by GOD" Himself is null and void unless subsequently *endorsed* by the Pope?

Once more, speaking of the condition of souls in our communion, he has contradictions quite as glaring. In

the quotation which he flings at us from S. Cyprian in the Preface, he tells us that we are "aliens, outcasts, enemies, joined to an adulteress, and no longer having God for a Father." But on p. 9, speaking of those of us who claim to be true Catholics, he says: "They are in *simple honest faith*; they act with *good conscience*, and accordingly they receive of God *grace, and joy and peace*." A queer way, this, of being "joined to an adulteress!" What *does* the Monsignor *mean*?

But let us now examine a little the privilege claimed for S. Peter:

Of the Twelve, Simon, who is called Peter, was chosen to be the Rock on which the Church was to be built; to him exclusively was [*sic*] given the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven; he received *separately* and in its *plenitude* that power of binding and loosing which subsequently was given to the Twelve collectively; he was selected specially to be the confirmer of the faith of all his brethren; and to him alone was given the fulness of authority to feed the lambs and the sheep—the whole flock of CHRIST. Thus was the unalterable constitution of the Church formed. All teaching power was in JESUS CHRIST, the Head, who imparted it to the Apostolic College, reserving special offices to Peter, the visible head.

To discuss fully all these points would take—as it has often taken—volumes. In a mere review we can only touch them briefly. But first of all we must premise, that Holy Scripture itself gives us strong antecedent ground for believing that any such sovereignty on the part of any one of the Twelve, is *expressly forbidden*. When the Disciples, again and again, disputed among themselves which of them should be the greatest, our LORD *never* answered them that He had appointed Peter as their head, and that they must all render to *him* absolute and unquestioning obedience. He expressly, and repeatedly, and pointedly, says the exact opposite. The command is not given to the laity, that *they* shall not call any one father or master on earth; for S. Paul and S. John expressly write to their people as their "children," and S. Paul tells them that they "have not many fathers," for *he* has "begotten them in the LORD." But the prohibition is given to the *Apostles*, that *they* should

not recognize any one as father or master, except their Father and Master in Heaven. When James and John requested places on His right hand and on His left, in His Kingdom, He did *not* reply, that He had already given the first place to S. Peter. He says that the appointment to such an office "*is not Mine to give*;" so it is *impossible* that He should already have given that office to S. Peter at Cæsarea Phillipi. Moreover, He expressly adds to the Twelve:

Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them. But *it shall not be so among you*.

Again, at the Last Supper we read:

And there was also a strife among them, which of them should be accounted the greatest. And He said unto them: The kings of the gentiles exercise lordship over them; and they that exercise authority upon them are called benefactors. But *ye shall not be so*; but he that is greatest among you, let him be as the younger; and he that is chief, as he that doth serve. * * Ye are they which have continued with Me in My temptations. And I appoint *unto you* [not "*unto Peter*"] a kingdom, as My Father hath appointed unto Me; that *ye may eat and drink at My table, in My kingdom, and sit on thrones* judging the twelve tribes of Israel.

This does not look like the threefold "*adoration*" that is given to the Pope on his election—first on the spot where he stands at the time; secondly, in the Sistine Chapel; and, thirdly, after they have *seated* him upon the High Altar in S. Peter's Church itself. Having an ALMIGHTY HEAD in Heaven and the abiding of the HOLY SPIRIT on earth, the Apostolic Body does not need a "Visible Head" at Rome. The *Twelve* will sit on *twelve* thrones. They are all *equal*.

But to return to Monsignor's attempt to make out the contrary, let us examine, point by point, what is said of S. Peter:

"To him exclusively," he says, "was given [the promise of] the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven." Adding the three words in brackets, this is correct. But what is meant by it? Some identify it with the power of bind-

ing and loosing, and many patristic names might be quoted in favor of that opinion. But it seems better to give it a specific meaning, which will apply to S. Peter alone, as the promise was made to him alone. One key S. Peter used on the day of Pentecost in opening the door of the Kingdom of Heaven to Jews from all parts of the world. *His* was the great sermon, at the hearing of which they were pricked at the heart, and three thousand were baptized into the Church at once. The other key (they are invariably represented as *two* keys, though there is nothing in the words of the promise to limit them to that number) S. Peter used in opening the door of the Kingdom of Heaven to the Gentiles. This he did by the special command of the HOLY SPIRIT, and he himself lays distinct stress upon it in the opening of his speech at the Apostolic Council in Jerusalem: "Men and brethren, ye know how that a good while ago *God made choice* among us that the Gentiles, by *my* mouth, should hear the word of the Gospel and believe." These two openings, granted specially to S. Peter, and shared by none else, fulfil the special promise abundantly. And it is easy to see that this promise of personal prerogative did not imply any permanent office in the Church. The act of *opening* once performed does not need to be repeated any more than a man needs to be born afresh every day of his life. To be born once will do for a lifetime. And the act of opening clearly did not imply any permanent sovereignty over both Jews and Gentiles; for S. Paul says: "The gospel of the uncircumcision was committed *unto me*, as the gospel of the circumcision was *unto Peter*." So that S. Peter had oversight only over part, and that was the part which was speedily to become the smaller, and eventually to disappear almost altogether; while S. Paul had the larger part, and that which was by and bye to become almost the whole of the visible Church. Moreover, S. Paul attributes this division to God himself: "for He that wrought effectually in Peter to the Apostleship of the circumcision, the same was mighty in me toward the Gentiles." And, as might be expected, this work of the SPIRIT was approved by the other Apostles

then at Jerusalem, *including S. Peter himself*: "And when James, *Cephas* and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship, that we should go unto the heathen and they unto the circumcision." This shows S. Peter and S. Paul to be precisely on the same level of authority and rule in the Church. The "opening" signified by the Keys, therefore, clearly did *not* mean a sovereign authority continuing even during S. Peter's own earthly ministry. It has about as much to do, then, with the Pope of Rome, as it has with the Man in the Moon.

Next as to the binding and loosing. Monsignor says that S. Peter "received *separately* and in its *plenitude* that power of binding and loosing which subsequently was given to the Twelve *collectively*." This is not correct. S. Peter did not *receive* that power separately *at all*. He was the first to receive the *promise* of that power. But that power *was not then given*. Our LORD'S Words are in the *future tense*. The promise of the Keys was in the future; and the other promise follows *after that*, and all the verbs in the sentence are in the *future*: "And whatsoever thou *shalt bind* on earth *shall be* bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou *shalt loose* on earth *shall be* loosed in heaven." This, therefore, is only the *promise*, not the conveyance of the gift. But when the gift was actually *given*, it was not given to S. Peter first, or separately, or in its plenitude; but to them *all collectively*: "He breathed on *them*, and saith unto *them*, 'Receive *ye* the HOLY GHOST; whose soever sins *ye* remit, they are remitted unto them, and whose soever sins *ye* retain, they are retained.'" Here the words are in the *present tense*, not the future, and actually *convey* what the former words only promised, but did *not* then convey, to S. Peter. The fiction, then, that he received *separately*, and in its *plenitude*, that which he manifestly received only *collectively* along with all the rest, is entirely exploded. There is not one word of substance in it. And, anyhow, it is a logical contradiction in terms. If the Twelve had the power *collectively*,

how *could* S. Peter have it "*separately* and in its *plenitude*" ? If the rest of the Twelve decided one way, and S. Peter "*separately*" and in his "*plenitude*" decided the other way, which decision would stand ? When S. Paul withstood S. Peter to the face, which of the two actually *yielded* ? No ; Monsignor is right in saying that the power "was given to the Twelve *collectively*." *That* is the Scriptural doctrine. *That* is the doctrine of the Fathers. *That* is Anglican doctrine. And it renders the "separate" and "plenitude" business logically impossible.

But S. Peter, we are told, "was selected specially to be the confirmer of the faith of all his brethren." That little word "*all*" is an addition by Monsignor. But let us look at the original passage, in S. Luke.*

And the LORD said "Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat ; but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not ; and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren. And he said unto him : 'LORD, I am ready to go with Thee, both into prison, and to death.' And He said : 'I tell thee, Peter, the cock shall not crow this day, before that thou shalt thrice deny that thou knowest Me.'

Now all this is so clearly tied together, that it must be taken together. Satan desired to sift all the Apostles. Why then did our LORD pray specially for Simon ? Clearly because he needed it most, as being the most presumptuous, self-confident and boastful. This is the more evident from the fact that, notwithstanding the benefit of the special prayers of his LORD, and His special and solemn warnings, Peter fell to a lower depth than any of the rest, except Judas Iscariot. Now are we to conclude that the Popes of Rome are so presumptuous, self-confident and boastful that they are in danger of denying their LORD with oaths and curses ? If not, what are they to be *converted from* ? for, be it noted, the strengthening the brethren was not to be possible to S. Peter, until *after* he was *converted* : "When *thou art converted*, strengthen thy brethren." If the Popes of Rome

* S. Luke xxii. 31.

need no "conversion," then *they* can have no part in "strengthening the brethren." In fact, this text is so weak a support of Roman claims that it never was used in that sense until the year 1621, when the famous Bellarmine, in the paucity of other texts of any use, pressed this one into the service for the first time. It was not wise. He would have done better to let it alone. And yet there *is* a sense in which it might well apply to Rome. No Branch of the Apostolic Church has fallen so low as Rome, in respect to her many corruptions, tyrannies, scandals, and separations among Christians. If she has not denied the Master herself, she has caused countless thousands to lose their faith in Him, and to become apostates. Now if she will only be "converted" from her usurpations of power, her additions to the Faith, and her innumerable practical corruptions, the reunion of all Christendom will at once become not only possible, but certain; and the "brethren" will be "strengthened" by this most desirable conversion quite as much as they have been scandalized for a thousand years past by the *need* of it.

But to pass on: Monsignor tells us of S. Peter that "to him alone was given the fulness of authority to feed the lambs and the sheep—the whole flock of CHRIST." Here again there is no authority for the exclusive word "*alone*." There is *no* equivalent for it in the Scriptural narrative. The simple meaning of that most touching incident, is, the restoration of S. Peter to that full Apostleship from which he had practically fallen by his threefold denial. The other ten Apostles, though they forsook Him and fled, yet had *not* denied Him, even once—not to say twice, and thrice, and with cursing and swearing. The threefold declaration of love was drawn from Peter, and the threefold charge given, *restoring* him to the position which the rest of the Apostles continued to hold all along. The proof of this is to be found in the very word on which our Roman friends rely to prove the contrary,—the use of the word *ποιμαίνω*. True, the first time and the third time, the LORD uses the word *βόσκει*, which signifies to *give food*, without any admixture of the

ideas of guiding, ruling or governing; ideas which *are* found with the other word, so that the Kings of the Greeks, in Homer, are frequently styled ποιμένες λαῶν—*Shepherds of the Peoples*. From the simple use of this word alone, Roman ingenuity blows up the glittering soap-bubble of "fulness of authority" over "the whole flock of CHRIST." But S. Paul, when, at Miletus, he took his tender farewell of the elders of the Church of Ephesus, said to them: "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the HOLY GHOST hath made you overseers, to *feed* the Church of GOD, which He hath purchased with His own blood." Here this word "*feed*" is, in the Greek, exactly the same word ποιμαίνω, on which such wonderful stress is laid in the other place. Why not give it the same interpretation here? Then *all* the "Elders of Ephesus" were *Popes*, "to whom *alone* was given the fulness of authority to feed the whole flock." Indeed, S. Paul expressly tells them that the Holy Ghost had made them overseers to "*all* the flock,"—which is more than the LORD said to S. Peter himself!

But, if S. Paul did not understand the correct use of language, surely that very S. Peter to whom that word was addressed, *could* not have applied it wrongly. In his first Epistle * he is exhorting the Elders—the same Order to whom S. Paul spoke at Miletus, those whom we now call Priests or Presbyters. And he says: "The elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder, and a witness of the sufferings of CHRIST, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed: *Feed* the flock of GOD which is among you," etc. Here the word he uses for "*feed*" is exactly that same word ποιμαίνω which our LORD had used to *him*. So that S. Paul and S. Peter both testify that the word expresses simply that cure of souls which is proper to every parish priest. The Papacy cannot be built up out of it any more than we can logically say: "John Smith is a parish priest; *therefore* he is the Emperor of all the World."

Only one point of S. Peter's Privilege is left. Our

* Chapter v. 1, 2.

Monsignor tells us—in the usual Roman phrase—“Peter was chosen to be *the Rock* on which the Church was to be built.” This text, “*Tu es Petrus*,” etc., is inscribed in large letters running round the root of the dome on the inside of S. Peter’s Church, in Rome. And by a very happy but undesigned symbolism, that inscription was not cut on the *foundation* of the building, or anywhere near it; but is hung up, more than an hundred and fifty feet high in the air, where it never could be kept aloft for an instant, but for the masses of human masonry with which it is bolstered up from below. And even so—if rumor be correct—it is showing signs of beginning to crack.

But to go to the interpretation. The word *Rock* is never used in Holy Scripture, as a title, of any but God Himself, or of those who were esteemed as gods. In the Old Testament it is thus used *thirty-five* times. *Not once* is it used, as a title, in any other way. In the New Testament, it is expressly used of CHRIST: “They drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them: and that Rock was CHRIST.” How would it do to try the Roman change *here*, and read: “They drank of that Spiritual Rock that followed them and that Rock was *Peter*”? And yet this change is not one whit more at variance with the whole strain of Scripture than the other; and it is only the fact that the strangeness of it has been worn off, by so many ages of controversy, which prevents the one from being as instantaneously repugnant to Christian instinct, as the other.

In the countless discussions of this text which have come before the Church, there has been an omission of one point which is worthy of special prominence, namely, that the *Stone* as well as the *Rock* is systematically used in connection with S. Peter’s Master; the word *Stone* denoting His *human* Nature, and the word *Rock* as we have already shown, His *Divine* Nature. It was *this* which Peter had just confessed in its fulness and clearness. It was *this* which made his confession of such startling importance. And it was to emphasize *this* that our LORD’S promises were then and there made to him. That Deity of the Son of God has been the

touchstone of orthodoxy all through the controversies of the ages. That Rock is the Rock of Ages. The wise man builds his house upon that Rock, and the rains and the floods and the winds can never make it fall. "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid." Is *that* foundation *S. Peter*?

But in order to obtain a clearer view, let us combine the various suggestions of Holy Scripture concerning that holy Temple of GOD. It is founded upon the Rock of Ages,—which is the Deity of CHRIST. "Upon *this Rock* I will build My Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." This agrees perfectly with S. Paul's words: "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is JESUS CHRIST." But we also find the word "foundation" used in another sense: not as the solid Rock on which the whole building stands, but as the first portion of the Wall itself which is built upon that Rock. It is in this sense that we read of the Church as "built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, JESUS CHRIST Himself being the head corner-stone." From this we see, that not only is it impossible that Peter can be the Rock of Ages, which is CHRIST our GOD; but he is not even distinguished specially as the entire foundation *wall* resting on that Rock. "The Apostles and Prophets" are *all* embodied in that wall. And here we would call special attention to the place occupied in it by CHRIST *as Man*. As GOD, He is the Rock on which *all* rests. As *Man* He is the *Corner-stone*, or "Head-stone of the corner." And now, if we will look back carefully, we shall find that in prophecies and deep sayings concerning our LORD's work, the word *Stone* is as constantly and consistently used to mean His *Humanity*, as the word *Rock* is, to signify *Deity*. Thus in Daniel's prophecy of the "*Stone cut out without hands*," the word "stone" signifies—not the Deity of CHRIST; for the stone grew till it "became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth." This cannot refer to CHRIST's Deity, for that being infinite from all Eternity, is capable neither of increase nor diminution. But it must mean His Humanity, for it is in this that He is the Head of

His Church, which has grown, and shall continue to grow, until it fills the whole earth. So also in the Prophet Zechariah: * "Upon one stone shall be seven eyes," which foreshows the sevenfold intelligence of the HOLY SPIRIT abiding upon the *Son of Man*. Then that most remarkable prophecy of the Psalmist, quoted and enforced by our LORD Himself: † "Did ye never read in the Scriptures, the *stone* which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner; this is the LORD's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes? . . .

Whosoever shall fall on this *stone* shall be broken; but on whomsoever it shall fall it will grind him to powder." Now, when, in all Scripture, none is ever honored with the title of *Rock* except GOD, and the humanity even of the LORD CHRIST Himself is called by the inferior title of *Stone*, how can any one reasonably contend that *Peter* has received the *Divine* title? Must the humanity of CHRIST Himself be ranked *lower* in dignity than the Apostle who denied Him with oaths and curses—who was on one occasion a "*Satan*" unto Him? Impossible!

There is one text in Isaiah which, with its quotation in the New Testament, includes both these terms—*Rock* and *Stone*—in one and the same sentence: "Sanctify the LORD of hosts Himself; and let Him be your fear, and let Him be your dread. And He shall be for a Sanctuary; but for a *Stone* of stumbling and for a *Rock* of offence to both the houses of Israel." Now of all the writers of the New Testament, who should it be but S. Peter himself who quotes this text in such a way as to show that *he* knows who the *Stone* is, and who is the *Rock*:

. . . if so be ye have tasted that the LORD is gracious. To whom coming, as unto a living *stone*, disallowed, indeed, of men, but chosen of God, and precious, ye also, as lively *stones*, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by JESUS CHRIST. Wherefore, also, it is contained in the Scripture, Behold I lay in Sion a chief corner *stone*, elect, precious, and he that believeth on Him shall not be confounded. Unto you, therefore,

* Chapter iii., 9.

† Matthew xxi., 42.

which believe, He is precious; but unto them which be disobedient, the *stone* which the builders disallowed, the same is made the head of the corner, and a *stone* of stumbling, and a *rock* of offence, even to them which stumble at the word, being disobedient.

Now when we consider the rejection of our LORD by the Jews, we find that the order here given was actually followed with perfect accuracy. *First*, they stumbled at the things concerning His Humanity: He was, as they supposed, of Nazareth; the son of a carpenter; an unlearned man; one utterly averse to the kind of secular kingdom which *they* identified with *their* idea of a MESSIAH. It was afterwards, and toward the end of His earthly ministry, that they took "offence" at the *Rock* of His *Deity*, which was not so plainly declared at the first; and when He "made Himself equal with God," they called Him a blasphemer, took up stones to cast at Him, and finally cried out "Crucify Him!" "Crucify Him!" Thus He was first a "*Stone*" of stumbling and afterwards a "*Rock*" of offence to both the houses of Israel. S. Peter, too, besides identifying both "*Stone*" and "*Rock*" with CHRIST, shows us how the term "*stone*" may be shared by others. For while CHRIST is "*a living stone*," a "*chief corner-stone*," "*elect, precious*," "*the head of the corner*"; he tells the Christian believers, to whom he writes, that they also "*as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house*." And, doubtless, there passed through his mind the signification of his own name *Peter*,—which is, being interpreted, *A Stone*—that name which CHRIST had given him when He first saw him on the banks of the Jordan where John was baptizing. For it is a mistake to suppose that the name Peter was *first given* on the occasion of that great confession at Cæsarea Philippi. In the opening chapter of S. John's Gospel we read, of S. Andrew:

He first findeth his own brother Simon and saith unto him, We have found the MESSIAS, which is, being interpreted, the CHRIST. And he brought him to JESUS. And when JESUS beheld him he said, Thou art Simon, the Son of Jona; thou shalt be called *Cephas*, which is, by interpretation, *A stone*.

This was more than *two years* before the confession

at Cæsarea Philippi. Doubtless, our LORD foreknew the future, and in His own mind selected Peter's new name with reference to that *Petra* which he would afterwards confess; but there was no direct external connection between that confession and the giving of that name. Peter had been called by that name, more or less, ever since he first saw the LORD. His name is *repeated*,—"Thou art Peter,"—to show that the LORD had originally *given* him the name, *foreseeing* the confession of the *Petra* which he had just made. *Cephas* in Syriac and *Petros* in Greek both mean the same thing. Our LORD's own Humanity, therefore, is spoken of as a *Stone*; and Peter is, by interpretation, a *Stone*; and all true believers are *lively stones* in the celestial building. But nowhere in Holy Scripture are true believers spoken of as "*lively rocks*." *That* title belongs to GOD. The other belongs to the Humanity of CHRIST, and may also be given to those who are His members.

The great Foundation of Rock, then, is "the Son of the living GOD" whom Peter confessed. On that Rock was laid the Foundation wall of the Apostles and Prophets, JESUS CHRIST Himself being the chief corner-stone. And in the vision of the New Jerusalem in the Apocalypse we find a brilliantly beautiful illustration. In the twelve foundations of that city were the names of the twelve Apostles of the Lamb, and twelve precious stones are enumerated in connection with them. These are mystical numbers,—not arithmetical. Those foundations "were garnished with *all manner* of precious stones." Surely, there are more than twelve kinds of jewels in the world; yet *twelve only* are mentioned. We must also remember that when the "Apostles and Prophets" are said to be the foundation, it is also added "JESUS CHRIST Himself being the chief corner-stone; in whom *all the building* fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple *in the LORD*." Now the "corner-stone" of the Twelve Foundations is, of course, the first to be mentioned. It is *Jasper*,—which is of the color of blood. And if we would know who is meant by this jasper, let us turn to the fourth chapter of the same

wonderful book, where we read that "A throne was set in heaven, and one sat on the throne [Monsignor will hardly contend that *this* was S. Peter]. And He that sat was to look upon *like a jasper* and a sardine stone." And so, besides the first foundation, we read that "the building of the *wall* of it was of *jasper*." So then we have the Son of the Living GOD as the Foundation of Eternal Rock; we have the Son of Man as corner-stone, as the entire wall and defence of His people, and reigning on the Throne of Heaven as their King. It will hardly do to take *all* this from our LORD and give it to S. Peter! And yet the Roman theory, to be consistent, would require it!

The voice of antiquity is as clearly against the Roman interpretation, as the analysis of Scripture itself. We cannot go fully into the matter here, for it would require a volume.* The earlier Fathers uniformly explain the *Rock* as being CHRIST our GOD, or the *confession* of, or the *faith* in, that same *Deity* of CHRIST: and even those who seem to interpret it of S. Peter, do it in such a way as to exclude all Roman inferences. For instance, S. Cyprian, in that Treatise on the Unity of the Church which Monsignor so kindly reprints, in our own translation, for our instruction, says, of S. Peter:

Upon him, being one, He builds His Church [this looks like the Roman interpretation; but he continues]: and though He gives to *all* the Apostles an *equal power* [that puts an end to the Romanism] and says: "*As My Father sent Me, even so send I you; receive ye the Holy Ghost; whosoever sins ye remit, they shall be remitted to him, and whosoever sins ye retain, they shall be retained;*" yet in order to manifest unity, He has, by His own authority, so placed the source of the same unity as to begin from one. *Certainly the other Apostles also were what Peter was*, endued with an *equal fellowship both of honor and power*; but a commencement is made from unity that the Church may be set before us as *one*.

What wonderful amiability the Monsignor displays by reprinting such declarations as *this* in the hope of thereby converting us to *the opposite*!

* See the admirable series of Articles on *The Petrine Claims* in the English *Church Quarterly Review*, to which we are not a little indebted, and which we hope soon to see reprinted in a volume. They utterly demolish the Roman position.

S. Augustine gives *exactly* the interpretation we have above embodied at large, and it is his latest and maturest judgment on the subject:

The rock is not from Peter, but Peter from the rock; just as CHRIST is not called from Christian, but Christian from CHRIST. Therefore it is that the LORD saith, "Upon this rock will I build My Church," because Peter had said, "Thou art the CHRIST, the Son of the living GOD." Upon this rock, this rock which thou hast confessed, I will build My Church. For *Christ was the rock*, on which foundation Peter himself was built. For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is CHRIST JESUS.

What can be clearer than this? But perhaps Monsignor will be more easily converted by the words of a Pope of Rome, whom—at least since 1870—he is bound to believe infallible. Gregory the Great says:

The Son of GOD is the beginning. In this beginning the earth was founded, because the Church is founded on Him. Hence the Apostle saith, "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, JESUS CHRIST." Hence He Himself, the Mediator of GOD and man, saith to the Prince of the Apostles, "Thou art Peter, upon this Rock I will build My Church." For *He is the Rock* from which Peter derived his name, and on which He said that He would build the Church.

Hoping that so clear a voice from so great a Pope will satisfy Monsignor of the truth of our interpretation, let us now look further, and see whether the Liturgies can shed any light on the subject.

The Liturgy of S. James speaks of "Thy Holy Catholic Church, which Thou hast founded on the *Rock of the Faith*, that the gates of hell may not prevail against it." No Romanism *there*: CHRIST is the Way, the *Truth*, and the Life. Nor is there any Romanism in another part of the same Liturgy, which speaks of "the glorious Zion, the *Mother of all the Churches*."

The Liturgy of S. Mark and the other liturgies afford *no* evidence in favor of the Roman theory, and some of them plain evidence to the contrary. Thus the Mozarabic Missal, though showing signs of later Roman manipulation, yet utters the primitive tone clearly. In the Collect for S. Peter's Chair, where we should expect—if

anywhere—to find Roman leanings, the opening words are:—"O God, Son of God, who didst exalt Peter *upon Thyself, the most solid Rock*, and upon Peter the Church," etc.

But as we wound up our brief extracts from the fathers with a Pope, perhaps we shall prevail more readily with Monsignor, by closing our briefer liturgical extracts, with one from that Roman Missal, with which he ought to be far more familiar than we are. In the collect for the Vigil of SS. Peter and Paul, he will find words, which, translated into English, run thus:

Grant, we beseech Thee, Almighty God, that Thou wouldst not suffer us, whom Thou hast established *upon the Rock of the Apostolic confession*, to be shaken by any disturbances.

This collect is evidently far older than the *modern* Roman theory. But if even a Pope, and the Roman Missal fail to convince Monsignor, perhaps he may learn, from what he calls a General Council, approved by the Pope, that "the firm and only foundation, against which the gates of hell shall not prevail," is neither S. Peter nor the Pope of Rome. The Council of Trent, in its decree upon the Symbol of the Faith [the Creed], says:

Wherefore, it [the Council] judged that the *symbol of the Faith*, which the Holy Roman Church uses, should be set forth in the full wording whereby it is read in all Churches, as that principle in which all who confess the Faith of Christ must needs agree, and as *the firm and only foundation, against which the gates of hell shall not prevail*, which is of this sort: "I believe in one God," &c.

Now since it is abundantly clear that S. Peter is not the Nicene Creed, and the Nicene Creed is not S. Peter, Monsignor must give up his notion that Peter is the foundation on which the whole Church is built. If he will not yield to Fathers, or Liturgies, to Roman Pope, or Roman Missal, or even to the Council of Trent, we shall—with all due amiability—give him over as incorrigible.

But when our Monsignor comes to treat specially of the Church of England and our own Church in this country, he is—if possible—more contradictory and inconsequential than anywhere else. As for the royal

supremacy—about which such a clatter is kept up—it is simply carrying out one precept of S. Peter himself, which his pretended successors have always been eager to forget; just as their entire Papal structure has been an elaborate rejection of his other plain command, *not* to be “as lords over God’s heritage.” S. Peter required those to whom he wrote, to “*submit to the King as supreme.*” And the Church of England is a true follower of S. Peter,—name and thing. But there has *not* been any surrender, at any time, by the Church, of that *Divine* power and authority which CHRIST gave to His Church. When the Convocation acted in regard to the King’s Supremacy in the reign of Henry VIII., notwithstanding the utmost bullying on the part of that unscrupulous and tyrannical king, the Convocation recognized that headship only with the qualification *quantum per legem Christi licet*: “So far as is lawful by the law of CHRIST.” That was the action of the Church on the subject; and of course it is *totally ignored* by our amiable and candid Monsignor.

But even the action of the State was clear of the outrageous gloss which Roman controversialists have constantly tried to force upon it. At the time of the passing of the act declaring the King’s Supremacy—as may be seen in so common a book as Froude’s History—the King’s Government drew up an explanatory document which shows the true scope and intent of the act. We commend the italicized passages to Monsignor’s careful attention:

The King’s Grace hath *no new authority* given hereby that he is recognized as supreme head of the Church of England; for in that recognition is included *only* that he have *such power as to a king of right appertaineth by the law of God*; and *not* that *he should take any spiritual power from spiritual ministers that is given to them by the Gospel*. So that these words that the King is Supreme Head of the Church, serve rather to declare and make open to the world that the King hath power to suppress all such extorted powers as well of the Bishop of Rome as of any other within this Realm whereby his subjects might be grieved; and to correct and remove all things whereby any unquietness might arise amongst the people; *rather than to prove that he should pretend*

thereby to take any powers from the successors of the Apostles that was given to them by God. And forasmuch as in the former session of this parliament, holden in the twenty-fifth year of this reign, whereby great exactions done to the King's subjects by a power from Rome was put away, and thereupon the promise was made that nothing should be interpreted and expounded upon that statute, that the King's Grace, his nobles or subjects, intended to decline or vary from the congregation of Christ's Church in anything concerning the articles of the Catholic Faith, or anything declared by Holy Scripture and the Word of God necessary for his Grace's salvation and his subjects'; it is not, therefore, meet lightly to think that the self-same persons, continuing the self-same Parliament, would, in the next year following, make an act whereby the King, his nobles and subjects should so vary. And no man may with conscience judge that they did so, except they can prove that the words of the statute whereby the King is recognized to be the Supreme Head of the Church of England, should show expressly that they intended to do so, as it is apparent that they do not.

This is unanswerably conclusive, and demonstrates that the outrageous construction put upon that action of Parliament by Monsignor, has not a leg to stand on. Even in its most stringent form, that title of "Supreme Head" was qualified by the words "under God," or "under CHRIST," or "in earth," showing clearly the determination *not* to usurp or interfere with that which is of *Divine* authority in the structure of the Church; yet the Monsignor writes as if it *wholly superseded* the very thing thus *expressly excepted from its operation*.

As a specimen of the conscientious accuracy of Monsignor, he tells us that "Henry VIII. was voted Spiritual Head of the Church;" and that "the said headship was decreed to be perpetual in Elizabeth and her successors." Whereas the *truth* is, that no such title as "*Spiritual* Head" was ever conferred on any King or Queen of England, by either Convocation or Parliament; and the "headship" was *not* "decreed to be perpetual in Elizabeth and her successors." So far from it, the title "head" was repealed under Queen Mary, and was *deliberately dropped* under Elizabeth, and has never been reenacted by either Convocation or Parliament from that day to this! The Monsignor evidently agrees with the

distinguished modern Ultramontane, who said that "to appeal to history, *is treason!*" No thorough Romanist can appeal to history *honestly*.

Monsignor quotes from the Address of the Convocation of Canterbury to the Crown in 1854, to show that it recognizes the royal supremacy in all causes ecclesiastical, and italicizes the words; but he calls no attention to the qualification immediately following: "*As it was maintained in ancient times, against the usurpation of the See of Rome, and was recovered and re-asserted at the Reformation.*" This distinct assertion of the continuity of the Church, and of the limitation of the very idea of the royal supremacy to that which history shows to have been ancient in England, is—with his usual fairness and candor—*totally ignored* by our amiable Monsignor. But we suppose we must excuse him. *What else could he do?*—unless he were to throw up his case altogether!

That statement, however, of the Convocation of Canterbury in 1854, addressed to the Queen, is precisely equivalent to the language of Queen Elizabeth herself, declaring that she only claimed the power "*which is, and was of ancient time*, due to the imperial crown of this realm; that is, *under God*, to have the sovereignty and rule over all manner of persons born within these her realms of what estate, either ecclesiastical or temporal, soever they be: so as no other foreign power shall or ought to have any superiority over them."

And this language of Henry VIII. himself, of the Convocation alone, and of the Queen alone, is borne out by the express language of Article XXXVII., which was set forth by both Houses of Convocation, approved by the Crown, and made obligatory by Act of Parliament besides:

Where we attribute to the Queen's Majesty the chief government, by which titles we understand the minds of some slanderous folks to be offended: "We give *not* to our Princes the ministering either of God's Word or of the Sacraments; the which thing the Injunctions also lately set forth by Elizabeth, our Queen, do most plainly testify; but *that only* prerogative which we see to have been given always to *all Godly Princes*

in *Holy Scriptures* by *God Himself*—that is, that they should rule all estates and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Temporal, and restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evil doers."

Nor is this to be found only in general statements, or in general legislation. It is embodied also in commissions given to individuals. Monsignor quotes from Edward VI. Letters Patent, appointing a Bishop, and he italicizes the words which he *wishes* us to understand as meaning the very thing they do *not* mean; but calls no attention whatever to the words in which the King professes to give only such powers to the Bishop as are "*over and above the things known to have been committed to him by God in the Scriptures.*" These words destroy entirely the very point Monsignor is trying to make,—they cut up his little bush by the roots. And yet he is simple enough to copy the words and print them; though he is amiable enough to italicize elsewhere, and take no more notice of them than if they were not in existence!

Nevertheless, we find our Monsignor in one place making acknowledgments which cover pretty much the whole ground. Speaking of the continued resistance to papal claims in England for centuries before the Reformation, he says:

Such claims, clearly enough, sprang not from the divine and essential character of the Papacy, but from the civil position and rights *created by the nations of Europe and conferred by them* on the Sovereign Pontiff in the Middle Ages, at a time when feudalism was the governing spirit, and the Pope was not only held to be the divinely appointed Head of the Church, but also was the unanimously-elected "Father of the Christian nations."

Of course, what was "created" and "conferred" by the nations upon the Pontiff, the nations could, if they saw fit, rescind and take away again; and this is just what was done in England. As to, the "divinely appointed Head," based on Peter's being the Rock, etc., *that* has vanished also by a return to the *ancient* interpretation of Holy Scripture, so that there is *nothing* left.

But the most monstrous proposition in the Monsignor's

little book remains to be considered. Before the "Acts of Parliament" were passed, the Church of England had some twenty Bishops, some nine thousand priests, and millions of baptized, confirmed and communing members. The Orders of Bishops and clergy, the grace of the sacraments to all the members, were—so the Monsignor confesses—given "*direct, by God.*" The Church of England was an integral and living portion of the Church of God. But *after* certain "Acts of Parliament" were passed, we are told, the effect was that "*the civil power reduced the Church in England to be the Church of England. Thus was it made a Department of State, deriving its authority and jurisdiction from the Crown, just as do the Army and the Judges.*" Now the Army and the Judges do not exhibit the slightest claim of grace from GOD through sacraments, clergy, or in any other way. This assertion of the Monsignor, therefore, amounts to a declaration that all the gifts of grace given "*direct, by God,*" to all the Bishops, priests and people of the Church of England, were abolished at one fell swoop by an Act of the English Parliament! "Outwardly," he admits, "the form was that of the old Church, but *inwardly* the *living Divine authority* was *substituted* by that of the *human power* of the Crown of England. It was a *new creation*—the 'Church of England.'" *Could* the English Parliament, by passing an act, touch in *anywise* the "*living Divine authority*" of the Church? *Could* an Act of Parliament substitute "*inwardly*" a "*human power*" in the place of that which was *Divine, "direct from God?"* Is it so easy for an Act of Parliament to be *more than a match* for GOD ALMIGHTY? Was there ever a more monstrous assertion made by a man professing to be a Christian? And does the amiable Monsignor himself *really believe* that this was *done*? Not a word of it! He says: "To the *Apostles* and *their successors* [this is the correct Anglican form; the Papal form would have been "to Peter and *his* successors"], but not to kings and rulers, was it said by JESUS CHRIST: 'As the Father hath sent me, so send I you;' 'go, teach all nations.' Therefore, no

act or acts of Parliament *could* confer on the sovereign, power in things *spiritual*." Very well, Monsignor! Then those acts of Parliament did *not* have power to make the gifts of God of none effect; they did *not* change the *spiritual* condition of the Church of England one particle; and the Church of England continued afterwards, as before, to be an integral, living portion of the true Church of the living God. Q. E. D.

If anything else were needed to demonstrate the utter silliness of the charge that Church authority in England has been substituted by the Civil Authority pure and simple, it is the sight, in our own day, of priests of the English Church who submit (and hundreds more are ready to follow their example), to imprisonment and deprivation rather than acknowledge the power of the State to change the slightest and most insignificant details of ritual without the free action of the Church.

The peculiar abomination, the pet horror, of Monsignor, is the idea of a *National Church*. And yet, in his quotation from S. Irenæus (p. 29), his own witness—as is usual with the *ancient* witnesses—turns against him, and talks of the Churches of different nations, just like an Anglican :

And neither do the *Churches* founded in *Germany* nor those of *Spain*, in *Gaul*, in the *East*, in *Egypt*, in *Africa*, nor in the regions in the middle of the earth, believe or deliver a different faith; but as God's handiwork, the Sun, is one and the same throughout the universe, so the preaching of the truth shines everywhere and enlightens all men that wish to come to the knowledge of the truth.

This way of speaking of National Churches is *our* way. The Church "of Spain" is no better than the Church "of England," as to the form of the phrase; and means precisely the same that is meant by the other phrase "*in Gaul*," "*in Egypt*," etc. all embodied in the same sentence. There is no hint in Holy Scripture that National distinctions are to be obliterated during the present dispensation, even in matters of religion. Our LORD's last commission to His Apostles is: "Go ye therefore and teach (disciple) all *nations*." And the Ancient Church speaks the same voice, agreeing per-

fectly with S. Irenæus. Canon xxxiv. of the Apostolic Canons says :

The Bishops of every *Nation* must acknowledge him who is *first among them*, and account *him* as their head, and do nothing of consequence without his consent; but each may do those things only which concern his own Diocese and the country places which belong to it. But *neither let him* [who is the first] do anything *without the consent of all*; for so there will be unanimity, and God will be glorified through the LORD JESUS CHRIST, etc.

This is the true Primitive idea, realized *exactly* in Anglicanism. The Chief Bishop in England is the Archbishop of Canterbury; in Ireland the Archbishop of Armagh; in Scotland the *Primus*; in various colonies, their Metropolitans; here in the United States, our Presiding Bishop. Not the slightest hint is found in the Apostolic Canons of any central jurisdiction belonging to the Pope of Rome. And in this respect our Anglican and American Canons are perfectly Apostolic.

As to our American branch of the Church, we must not be too severe on the Monsignor. His chief post—that which is first mentioned on his title-page—that of “Domestic Prelate of His Holiness, Leo. XIII., happily reigning,” and his second post, that of “Member of the Roman Congregation of the Segnatura,” and his third place (which does not seem to be contemporaneous with the other two), of “Priest of the Archdiocese of Westminster,” have doubtless absorbed too much of his time and attention, to permit him to be very well posted on such insignificant things as American affairs. When we find it gravely put down that because there were previously Romish Bishops in South America and Mexico, and in the then Spanish colony of Florida, and in the French colony of Canada, *therefore* it was an *intrusion* for *us* to have Bishops in New York, Connecticut and Virginia *before* there were, or ever had been, any Roman Bishops in these United States, we can but laugh! It puts us in mind of the Englishman in London who begged his American friend who was just starting for New York, to deliver a letter for him to his cousin who lived in New Orleans. But if he has not learned theology

abroad, it is to be feared that he will not remain among us long enough to learn geography here! And we must not forget that Monsignor's knowledge of the geography of the Old World is such that he puts Jerusalem in Asia Minor!

As to the ecclesiastical position of our Church he says:

She holds no communion with Rome; she has no jurisdiction from the See of Peter; *consequently* she forms no part of the Organic Body of Christ, nor indeed of any other organism; for, like her Mother, and apart from that Mother, she forms a separate and independent Corporation, possessed of human authority, and bereft of *every shred* of the *divine* jurisdiction which appertains to the Catholic Church.

The amiable Monsignor forgets what he had already said about Mission being given "direct by God," in every valid Ordination. One would think—to read the above—that a Pope could nullify God's direct gift, as easily as if the said Pope were an Act of Parliament! On the next page (p. 69) he says: "*Admit the validity of the Orders*, whence does the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States derive its mission and jurisdiction?" And on the very same page he has already (without seeming to know it) given us the answer to his question in a quotation from S. Ignatius:

The words of S. Ignatius, of the second century, are as true now as then. He says: "Apart from *the Bishop*, it is neither lawful to baptize nor to hold an agape; but whatever he judges right, that also is well pleasing unto God, that all which is done may be safe and sure.

This is our position exactly. S. Ignatius is one of the standard authorities of Anglicanism. There is no more recognition, in his Epistles, of any "fountain-head" of "mission and jurisdiction" in the Pope of Rome, than there is in the *Digest* of the Canons of our American Church. S. Ignatius speaks only of "the Bishop." We have him. We have him *validly* consecrated. All our baptisms and eucharists are in subordination to his canonical authority. We therefore *know*—according to S. Ignatius—that "all which is done is safe and sure," and "well pleasing unto God." S. Ignatius says nothing

about the *Pope*. It is nothing to us, therefore, whether *he* is pleased or not.

A vast amount of dust is raised by modern Roman writers about "Mission and Jurisdiction," and Monsignor Capel does his little best in the same direction. But the matter is simple enough, in its essence. "Mission" is the gift, given "direct by God," in every valid ordination, as in every valid Sacrament. S. Thomas Aquinas says :

Spiritual power is twofold—one sacramental, the other jurisdictional. That is sacramental which is bestowed by any consecration. But all consecrations of the Church are permanent as long as the thing remains which is consecrated. . . . And therefore such power continues in its essence in a man who has received it by consecration, as long as he lives, whether he fall into schism or into heresy. And this is plain from the fact that on returning to the Church such an one is not consecrated again. [Then speaking of those who are put under discipline so that it may not be lawful for them to use their power, he adds:] Nevertheless, if they use it, their power is *effective* (*effectum habet*) in sacramentals; because in these man does not operate except as the instrument of God; wherefore, sacramental effects are not excluded on account of any fault whatsoever of the one giving the sacrament. Moreover, jurisdictional power is that which is conferred by *the mere concession of man*, and such power does not inhere immovably.

Among these "*sacramentals*" S. Thomas expressly includes *Poenitentia* and *Ordo*. As Monsignor is careful to tell us more than once that absolutions would be "null and void" if given by a deposed Bishop, though "his ordinations would be valid," we beg to recommend him to a fresh study of S. Thomas, reminding him that the present Pope, "Leo XIII., happily reigning," has restored S. Thomas to his old position of authority and influence. And the Anglican Bishops have never been even nominally deposed by the Pope or by anybody else. The validity of their orders being granted, therefore, validity of all their sacramental acts follows, even if they are in schism and heresy; and they are in neither the one nor the other.

Jurisdiction, S. Thomas tells us, "is conferred by the mere concession of man." It is properly the *limiting* of

the general power of Order, to some special field of labor for the better securing efficiency of work and peace among the workmen. Its essence is found in the old Œcumenical Canon, that no one should be ordained *at large*—that is without some special field of work ready for him. No Bishop was to be consecrated without a Diocese; no priest or deacon except for some particular parish or charge; and, by the older Canons, no Bishop, priest or deacon was ever to remove to another place of labor than that for which he was first ordained. Moreover, another Canon forbade that a Bishop should be forced upon an unwilling Diocese. A valid ordination, then, for Mission, and a willing people for Jurisdiction (that willingness being manifested either before or after ordination), are the essentials. The Canons of the Church, from the beginning, have regulated all else that needs to be considered as to causes of discipline, or danger of intrusion, or any other variation from the general idea here given. As to the modern Roman notion that *all* jurisdiction comes from the Pope of Rome alone, it is totally without foundation either in Holy Scripture or antiquity, and may be consigned to the same limbo which receives the notion that Peter is the Rock of Ages.

The Monsignor has some things to say about our legal name "Protestant Episcopal." We are no admirers of that name. But he need not trouble himself on that score. He will find that name duly authorized in the creed of that undisputed General Council of the Undivided Church, which, at the same time, gave the title "*Orthodox*" to the Oriental Patriarchates, and to the Western, or Latin, portion of the flock gave the name of "*The Holy Roman Church*." Moreover, if he fail to find that General Council, we will remind him that the attempt to omit the word "Roman" from the legal title of his own Church, was voted down at Trent, and at the Vatican Council also, just as the attempt to strike out the words "Protestant Episcopal" was voted down at our General Convention last October. And the one is a very pretty offset for the other. *Every* part of the Church which holds the Catholic Faith as set forth by the undis-

puted General Councils, and has a ministry of the unbroken Apostolic Succession, is a Branch of the true Vine, and has a *right* to the name of Catholic, no matter what local designation may be in use besides. If Mr. Smith have seven sons, the oldest, named John, has no right to insist that *he* is the *only* true Smith, and that no one of the other six has any right to the family name. Monsignor's claim to the "exclusive" use of the word "Catholic" is equally empty. The insisting on the addition of "Roman" both at Trent and at the Vatican Council *proves* that they know this themselves.

By-the-way, after all that is said to the disparagement of King and Parliament, it is comical to see the seriousness with which Monsignor quotes from Newman the declaration that "The *Emperor Gratian*, in the fourth century, had ordered that the Churches, which the Arians had usurped, should be restored to those [not who held 'the Catholic Faith,' or 'the Nicene creed,' or were 'in communion with the *orbis terrarum*,' but] '*who chose the communion of Damasus, the then Pope,*' just as if the *Emperor Gratian* were not as purely "civil authority" as Queen Elizabeth or the English Parliament. And would he have done so if *Liberius* had then been Pope, or *Vigilius*, or *Honorius*? And if he *had*,—what *then*?

It is edifying, too, to read the Monsignor's admiration for *Magna Charta*. Speaking of the English Church before the Reformation, he says:

Its independence of the State was secured by *Magna Charta*, in these words: "The *English Church* is, of Divine right, free, and its laws and liberties are not to be violated." Church and State grew side by side in harmony, rendering mutual aid, and formed "*Merrie England*."

And this glorification of *Magna Charta* is given by an Ultramontane Romanist, in seeming ignorance of the significant fact that the then Pope excommunicated the Archbishop of Canterbury who helped to gain it, and declared *Magna Charta* itself to be null and void! It is a happy instance, showing how little regard was paid to the Pope three hundred years before the Reformation. The excommunication was regarded by nobody; and

Magna Charta, which the Pope declared to be null and void, has not even begun to be null and void yet! Who cares? Apparently, not even Monsignor Capel!

It is not unpleasant to read what the Pope said to the Archbishop of Canterbury (Theodore) a thousand years ago. He says: "By authority of Blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, to whom power was given by our Lord to bind and to loose in Heaven and on earth, we, however unworthy, holding the place of that same Blessed Peter, who bears the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, grant to you, Theodore, and your successors, *all that from old time was allowed, forever to remain unimpaired* in that your Metropolitan See in the City of Canterbury." Our modern Roman controversialists on behalf of the Pope would fain make us believe that this, the Pope's promise and gift "*forever to remain unimpaired*," is now utterly null and void. But we think better of His Holiness than that! It was hardly worth while, indeed, to lug in S. Peter as having anything to do with conveying to Theodore "all" that the Archbishops of Canterbury had *already* been enjoying "*from old time*." It sounded generous, and was certainly quite safe, however, to give to the Archbishop what belonged to his See anyhow. It was a way the Popes had. But if there was anything at all in the gift *prospectively*, we would only call Monsignor's attention to the fact, that as the Pope gave the Archbishop of Canterbury all these things, in the name of Blessed Peter, and to the Archbishop's "*successors*," "*forever to remain unimpaired*," of course, if there is any truth or reality in a gift from a Pope, the Archbishop of Canterbury *must retain them all, to this day*. To deny it, and maintain that they are all gone, and that the Archbishop is only "an agent of the Crown," is to be guilty of flat blasphemy against *the Pope!*

One of the most astounding assertions of our amiable Monsignor is in his statement of the position of the Methodists as compared with ours. He says, of Methodism:

The spiritual authority to which it lays claim is derived from no ex-

ternal source; it was begotten by its own clergy, and can be restricted, extended or destroyed by the acts of the Body. The authority is indubitably human. The "Protestant Episcopal Church" of the United States has *no other title to its authority in things spiritual*. It cannot produce any credentials to show that it derives authority from the Living Mystic Body of CHRIST. In common with its Methodist sister, it can claim only that authority which was *created by its members*, an authority purely human, not Divine.

The Methodist ministers in England, after Wesley's death, at their regular conference, *voted*, that thenceforth, wherever it was desired, their preachers (though not ordained men) should administer both the Sacraments. They voted it to themselves, without any ceremony. In America, the Methodists derive their orders from John Wesley, who, being only a priest, never had any power to ordain at all, and such an ordination *never* was accounted valid in any Branch of the Catholic Church, in any age. Our Orders come to us by an unbroken succession of Bishops, the threefold chain being derived by us from the Mother Church of England, and by her from the unquestioned Western Church before the Reformation, *no consecration* having ever taken place among us with less than three Bishops uniting in the act—consecrations which are valid by the ancient canons, and by the principles of *every* Branch of the Holy Catholic Church, in every age, including Rome herself, as we have already shown from S. Thomas Aquinas—consecrations which convey a spiritual gift "*direct from God*," as Monsignor himself admits. And yet he says that these two "titles" to spiritual authority are just the same! We are afraid that our amiable Monsignor has lost the power to blush!

Another sly trick strengthens this reluctant suspicion. In the text of his treatise (p. 30), he quotes S. Cyprian as saying:

He who holds not this unity of the Church, does he think that he holds the Faith? He who strives against and resists the Church, *he who abandons the Chair of Peter, upon whom the Church was founded*, does he feel confident that he is in the Church?

On p. v. of Part II., in which the entire Treatise is

reprinted, the words I have italicized (which are the only ones of any real use to Monsignor) are *totally omitted*, and very correctly. They are a Papal interpolation,—one of the almost innumerable interpolations and forgeries of all sorts, by which Roman partisans have attempted to make the ancient witnesses lisp the modern Shibboleth. Baluze's note stands in the Benedictine edition, giving the facts of the case, showing that the words are absent from almost *every* extant MS. of S. Cyprian, and from *every* printed edition till one, in 1563. Monsignor may not have known about this, but in that case he was hardly qualified to write on such a subject at all. But the marvellous thing is to see the happy-go-lucky unconsciousness with which, after pressing the *forged* passage on us in Part I., without the slightest hint of its being even doubtful, he coolly reprints the *correct* version in Part II., as if he would not care to blush even if he were found out.

But we must close—rather from want of space than of material. And in closing, we would present a contrast, as to the *living voice* on either side, and the probability as to whether of the twain is the more likely to be a safe guide unto Truth.

On the one side is the Pope of Rome, claiming for himself, without the consent of the Church, all power over faith and morals, and proving it by adding two dogmas in our own day, and under one and the same Pope, Pius IX. The one of these dogmas—the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary—was scouted by S. Bernard as a novelty in the twelfth century, and a ridiculous novelty at that; yet *he* is still a "Saint," though if he were alive now, and should teach the same as he taught *then*, he would be *excommunicated* by her who calls herself *semper eadem*—"always the same." The other dogma—that of the infallibility of the Pope—set forth only in 1870, is far worse. Before that fatal year, the authorized teaching of the Roman Church in Scotland, Ireland and this country, in "Keenan's Controversial Catechism," was as follows:

Q. Must not Catholics believe the Pope himself to be infallible?

A. *This is a Protestant invention; it is no article of the Catholic Faith; no decision of his can bind, on pain of heresy, unless it be received and enforced by the teaching body, that is, by the Bishops of the Church.*

Since 1870 this "Protestant invention" has become "the Catholic faith," and every Romanist is bound to believe that it has always been the Faith from the beginning. He is bound to believe that the Pope's decisions are binding "*of themselves*," and "*not* by the consent of the Church."

Also, the Romish Bishops of Germany, the year before the Vatican decision, met at Fulda and unitedly issued a Pastoral to their people, in which they told them that there was no danger that the Infallibility of the Pope was going to be made a dogma. They declared that this infallibility was no part of the original Deposit of Faith, that it *could not* be made a dogma, and that even if it were made a dogma by an Œcumenical Council, it would not bind any man's conscience. *After* the Council, they returned to Germany, ate all their own words, professed that Infallibility *was now* a part of the Catholic Faith, and had been from the beginning, and excommunicated all who would not turn their coats as readily as they had done themselves. This dogma of Infallibility runs backward as well as forward, giving Romanists a heavy load to carry in Liberius, and Vigilius, and Honorius, and quite a number of others. If infallibility be true, then Honorius *could not* have been a heretic. Yet, if that be the case, what becomes of the infallibility of a long line of Popes, *every one* of whom *excommunicated Honorius as a heretic*? But, as aforesaid, the appeal to history is treason—to a Romanist—for it knocks Infallibility all to pieces.

So much for purity and stability of doctrine in our own day. As to the effect of all this, a little story may illustrate the true state of the case. A Romish priest in this country was talking with one of his leading laymen in regard to these two new dogmas, and seemed to be more and more scandalized as the layman uttered opinions that were anything but docile. At length the priest, in a menacing manner, asked him plainly: "Do you not, then,

believe in the Immaculate Conception and the Infallibility of the Pope?" To which the layman boldly replied: "No, I don't; and nobody can make me!" Whereupon the priest, after a brief pause, with an entire change of manner and voice, said quietly, but very significantly: "*Neither do I!*" Is that Church likely to be a safe guide to Truth?

And as to Unity, it is as bad or worse. A thousand years ago, Papal usurpation and ambition led to the Great Schism—the Pope excommunicating the other four Patriarchs and all their adherents, and Monsignor alludes to them as the "Greek sects," accordingly. After hundreds of years of increasing corruptions, tyrannies and scandals, and vain cries for "Reform" in every Council that met during those ages—the need of it being confessed with the utmost freedom in the sermon preached at the opening of the Council of Trent—the storm burst, and the Pope excommunicated England, Scotland, Holland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden and large parts of Germany and Switzerland. In our day the new dogmas have been followed by a fresh schism, and the *Old Catholics*, who cannot swallow the novelties, are excommunicated, as were all the rest. How can the Pope be necessary to the preservation of the Church, when he has caused greater, more obstinate, and more destructive *divisions* than all other causes put together?

Now let us look at the other side. As to the Truth, (remembering Monsignor's happy declaration that before our LORD ascended into heaven, He "did make known *the whole* of that doctrine which He had received of His FATHER, and in doing this, He *completed* and *closed* the Revelation made to man), the Anglican position is simple. Its dogmatic statements are the creeds and other definitions of the Undivided Church, which *forbade further additions to be made*. We, therefore, add nothing. That truth, which is the same "yesterday, to-day and forever," is enough for us. We ask no more. We accept no less.

And as to Unity, we would point to the Lambeth Conference of 1867, which met and adjourned before the call for the Vatican Council was issued. A larger number of Bishops met there than *ever* have met in *any*

council since the Great Schism, outside of the Communion of Rome; more than were in attendance even at many sessions of the Council of Trent. They met, not on a summons, in obedience to despotic power, but in response to a brotherly invitation which recognized the equality of all, according to Holy Scripture and the ancient Canons. Their decisions were spontaneously unanimous, needing none of that terrible pressure which is so indispensable a feature of all Roman Councils. After expressing their sorrow for the divisions of Christendom, they thus point out the true way to unity: "We do here solemnly record our conviction that unity will be most effectually promoted by maintaining the Faith in its purity and integrity—as taught in the Holy Scriptures, held by the Primitive Church, summed up in the Creeds, and affirmed by the undisputed General Councils—and by drawing each of us closer to our common LORD by giving ourselves to much prayer and intercession, by the cultivation of a spirit of charity, and a love of the LORD's appearing." It is in perfect harmony with this noble declaration that, while Roman methods make old quarrels incurable, and are constantly stirring up new ones, the Anglican method and position are bringing forth already wonderful drawings toward Unity. The Unity that exists among the two hundred Bishops of our Anglican Communion is visible to all. We are in open communion with the Old Catholics. The signs of approaching full communion with the great Oriental Church grow stronger from year to year. The explanation as to the Double Procession of the HOLY GHOST, happily agreed upon at Bonn by Prelates and Theologians Oriental, Old Catholic, Anglican and American, has done more to heal that old wound, than all the frauds and force employed at Florence, or all the controversies of a thousand years. Armenians and Copts are beginning to look toward England for sympathy and aid. The bitterness of Protestant divisions is steadily diminishing, and their drawing toward the Church becomes more apparent day by day. In brief, the Anglican influence is working as visibly and indisputably toward Unity on

Apostolic foundations of Doctrine, Discipline and Worship, as Rome is creating and perpetuating schisms.

Whether for Truth or Unity, therefore, England is a safer guide than Rome. And our amiable Monsignor, while saying many things, and giving us many quotations, which prove our position to be sound, has said nothing,—no matter how hard he tried—which disturbs us in the least. If he wounded us on one page, he was sure to furnish plenty of healing salve on another. And we shall await every fresh appearance of his amiable countenance upon the field of controversy as the opening up of a fresh fountain of amusement.

J. H. HOPKINS.

CORRESPONDENCE.

NEW YORK, 365 FIFTH AVE., September 18, 1884.

REVD. SIR:—By an advertisement I learn that you are to reply to my monograph, "Catholic." The fourth edition has just been issued, and as it may not have been seen by you, I send you a copy, and I beg to call your attention to the important additions made in sections 3 and 4.

As I am only anxious to aid in bringing about the increase of the One Fold under the One Shepherd, I venture to call your attention to this new edition. Later, will add a postscript, by way of rejoinder to you and others.

I am, Revd. Sir, Yours faithfully,

T. J. CAPEL.

Revd. Dr. J. H. HOPKINS.

WILLIAMSPORT, PA., September 30, 1884.

VERY REVD. SIR:—The "reply" to which you allude in your favor of the 18th inst., is simply a Review, written in four days stolen from very pressing duties, shortly after the appearance of the first edition of your pamphlet. My completed MS. has been in the hands of the Editor of the *American Church Review* since the early part of July. Your letter reaches me just as the last revised proofs are passing through my hands. I have delayed them as long as I dared, hoping to receive the copy of

the fourth edition which you have been kind enough to send me; but it has not yet arrived.

The courtesy of the Editor of the REVIEW, in which my article appears, will doubtless give me room, in some subsequent issue, for any further notice that may seem to be demanded by the additions of which you have informed me, or by the "rejoinder" which you promise. It is all that I can do at present.

Reciprocating the earnestness of your desire for "the increase of the One Fold under the One Shepherd," but convinced by the history of the last thousand years that it will never be brought about in the Roman way, I am,

Very Revd. Sir, Your ob't serv't in the Church,

J. H. HOPKINS.

To the Very Revd. Monsignor T. J. CAPEL.

Domestic Prelate of His Holiness, etc., etc.

WILLIAMSPORT, PA., October 2, 1884.

VERY REV. SIR:

Your telegram has been received, and the copy mailed me has just arrived—too late for use this time. The fact that the address on the wrapper was simply, "I. Hoppins, Esq., Williamsport, Pa.," will exonerate the CHURCH REVIEW office and the U. S. Mail service from any responsibility for the delay in the transmission of the pamphlet to me.

Y'r ob't ser't in the Church,

J. H. HOPKINS.

To the Very Rev. Monsignor T. J. CAPEL.

FASTING COMMUNION—A RE-STATEMENT.

WE have no contention with those who choose to receive the Blessed Sacrament of the Eucharist, fasting rigorously from the close of the previous day. But the attempt to exalt this liberty into an obligation, binding on the conscience by virtue of any authority Divine or Ecclesiastical; to teach that those who communicate after taking any refreshment on any given day are guilty of sin; or that they violate any general rule or universal custom of the early Church, we strenuously resist.

Rev. Mr. Percival, in the March number of the REVIEW, makes rejoinder to our argument in January. Our five propositions were:—

1. That such Fasting Communion is not, but quite the contrary is, intimated in Holy Scripture. (*This is conceded.*)

2. There is no evidence that for 390 years of the Christian Era any rule for Fasting Communion was ever formulated in any part of the Church. (This is not disputed; but a controversy arises as to the meaning of that rule.)

3. There is no proof that for 1,000 years of the Christian Era *such Fasting Communion* was the universal custom.

4. The Canons cited in support of such a binding rule are few, late, of doubtful interpretation and of local application, and not one of them of œcumenical force.

5. "Fasting" in the writings of the early centuries did not mean what has of late been asserted. (*This proposition is not assailed save by a sneer.*)

In our article in January we meant to go over the whole ground, and omit *no* authority. Mr. Percival says "I cannot take time to follow Dr. Benedict in his special pleadings to evade the force of *the few Patristic quota-*

tions he makes," etc. Now we claim to have honestly sought to make *all* such references. Mr. Percival gives *one* additional, to which we will reply by *and* by. Will he tell us of any other of any value to his side for the first 600 years? There is here an *unfair* suggestion of unfairness on our side.

We said that Bishop Kingdon's work had *never been answered*. Admitted by Mr. Percival, who also adds, "No attempt has ever been made. How can a book be answered in which the author gravely asserts that Fasting when used by the early Church means after breakfast?" The ground on which we stand in our fifth proposition is surrendered with a sneer. What is that ground? Why, Fasting in ante-Nicene writings, in S. Augustine and other writers of the fourth and fifth centuries, does not imply an entire abstinence from all refreshment from the beginning of the day; in most of the passages *can not* be made to bear that sense. It does indeed seem a little noteworthy that a man should be said to be fasting after he has had a *break-fast*. But time enters into the consideration, and also the original and the acquired meanings of the word. The question is, Can a man be hungry again, *jejeunus* after breakfast? We know he can. Can a man be said to be fasting who, in observing an appointed ecclesiastical fast, takes any refreshment? We affirm that he can. Do the ante-Nicene writers, S. Augustine and other Fathers and historians of the fourth and fifth centuries, and the Canons of Hippo, Laodicea and Carthage, any of them use the word in either of these qualified significations? We affirm, and think we have proved, that they do. Our antagonists must disprove our affirmation, and not treat the absurdity of our argument as a foregone conclusion.

The Clementine Recognitions give one instance of a fast of a whole day before baptism. But nothing of this sort in reference to Holy Communion. In one place in the Apostolic constitutions, Christians are told to fast *entirely* on the Friday and Saturday of Holy Week till cock-crowing; both days if they can, one always, on Easter Even; but not in order *to communicate*, at least

it is not so said. On other days in Holy Week they are to *fast* on salt, herbs, water or dry bread, *abstaining from wine and flesh* till the ninth hour. So Hermes and Tertullian use the word *fasting*. So far as we can discover, with one exception given above, it is not otherwise once used in all ante-Nicene literature. The Council of Laodicea a little later commands men not to break their fast on Maundy Thursday but to fast through the whole Lent *on dry diet*. We refer the reader to pp. 48-50 of the January number.

And now we come to the time of S. Augustine and the Council of Hippo. Up to this date it has not been absurd for the ancients to speak of men *fasting* who had in some sense broken their fast. Our inference would be that we may find that S. Augustine and the Africans speak in the same way. *And so they do.*

That passage of S. Paul, 1 Cor. xi. 31. "The rest will I set in order when I come," on which we said so much of baseless inference has been built, we are quite willing to believe may indicate an Apostolic ruling as to the time of celebration. What that ruling may have been we can gather only from some general custom prevailing in subsequent years. What was the custom in S. Augustine's day, say A.D. 400? Mr. Percival says S. Augustine built *so* much on this text in the end of the fourth century, and in so building he refers to the living evidence of "the Universal Church throughout the world without any variation of custom whatever." Now S. Augustine does *not* say that a rigid fast from the preceding day till after the reception of the Eucharist, was the universal custom. The only passage in S. Augustine which can be claimed to say this is the following, in his celebrated letter to Januarius, Epis. LIV.:

It is very apparent that when the disciples first received the Body and Blood of the LORD they did not receive *fasting*; must we now blame the Universal Church because it is always received by *fasting* men? For so it pleased the HOLY GHOST that for the honor of so great a Sacrament the LORD's Body should enter into the mouth of a Christian *before* other food ('have precedence' in entering, is the suggestive rendering of the Edinburgh translator). And therefore this

custom is observed throughout the whole world. Nor, because the LORD gave it *after* food, therefore ought the brethren to meet to receive that Sacrament *after the prandium* or the *cæna*,* or as they did whom the Apostle blames and corrects, *minge it with their tables*. For the SAVIOUR, that He might the more earnestly commend the depth of that Mystery, wished to fix this last upon the hearts and memory of His disciples, from whom He was to turn to His Passion. And on this account He did not teach *in what order*† it should hereafter be taken; in order to preserve this position for the Apostles by whom He was about to order the Churches. For if He had given them this monition, that it should always be received *after* other food, I believe that none would have changed that custom.

When, however, the Apostle, speaking of this Sacrament, says: *Wherefore, brethren, when ye come together to eat, tarry one for another, and if any hunger let him eat at home, that ye come not together for condemnation*, he at once subjoined, *But the rest will I set in order when I come*. Whence we may understand (since it was much that he should suggest in an epistle the whole order of procedure which is to be observed by the whole Church throughout the world) that *that* was set in order by him which is not varied by any difference of customs. But a certain laudable reason has found favor with some, that on one certain day in the year on which the LORD gave the very Supper, as if for a more striking commemoration, the Body and Blood of the LORD might be offered and received *after* food.

But I think this had better be done at such an hour that he who has also kept the fast may come to the oblation *after* the refectation at three o'clock. Wherefore we compel none to take the *prandium before* that LORD's Supper, but we dare forbid none. (Italics ours.)

The custom was *before* dinner, not *after*; *before* supper, not *after*; *before* men had satisfied their appetite, and hence were still hungry, *jejeuni*, fasting; not having eaten their mid-day meal, *prandium*, call it luncheon or dinner, or their *cæna*, call it dinner or supper. *This* was the custom so general that the brethren ought not to come together to receive the Sacrament (*pransi aut cænati*) *after* they have dined or supped, giving as a reason that the LORD gave it *after* supper. This is all you can, with any clearness or certainty, make out of S.

* *Pransi aut cænati*.

† *Quo deinceps ordine*.

Augustine or any Christian writer for more than six hundred years of the Christian Era. Here is the issue fully made and squarely met.

That we are correct in our interpretation of the language of S. Augustine and the Canon of Hippo in regard to this custom, let Gregory Nazienzen, from Asia Minor, be cited, ten or fifteen years before the Council of Hippo was called. He is telling how Christians in some respects had deviated from the original institution. Orat. XL.:

Our LORD celebrated the Mystery in an upper room, and *after* supper; we in our churches and *before* supper.

Not before breakfast, observe. Let S. Ambrose from Italy be cited. He was S. Augustine's teacher; and about the same time said (Com. on Ps., cxviii.):

The fast has been proclaimed; take heed, neglect it not. If *hunger* is forcing you to take your daily dinner (*prandium*), or if lack of refreshment declines the *fasting*, yet keep yourself all the more for the celestial banquet. Do not let the *feasts which have been prepared* force you to be empty of the heavenly food.

Here is a man *in Lent* inclined to go to his *prandium* or prepared *feast*, spoken of as fasting, hungry. It is not his *jentaculum*, breakfast, that is waiting for him, but his mid-day meal, his *prandium*.

Let S. Chrysostom, from Constantinople, the Capital of the Empire, be cited. The *Christian Year Calendar*, Rev. Mr. Percival in his Rejoinder, and the Rev. Richard Hall in his "*Fasting Reception*," 1881, say that he was charged with having given the Eucharist to people who were *not fasting*. "*After they had eaten*" is the language of S. Chrysostom, as we were careful to state in our January article, p. 43. Why this persistent, misleading use of the word *fasting*? To the charge he says, *Epis.* 125:

If I have done any such thing let my name be blotted out of the roll of Bishops, nor be inscribed in the book of the Orthodox Faith. Since, lo! if I had done any such thing CHRIST would cast me out of His kingdom. But if they once say this to me, and are contentious, let them degrade Paul, who, *after supper*, baptized a whole household; let them degrade the LORD Himself, who gave the Communion to the Apostles. *after supper*.

Observe the exact correspondence between the words "*after they had eaten*" in the charge, and "*after supper*" in the defence. S. Chrysostom indignantly denies that he had violated the law of the Church. Mr. Poyntz very reasonably suggests that his enemies had charged him with untruthfulness. He had been charged also with *baptizing after supper*. He repels that charge in pretty much the same style. S. Chrysostom often speaks of fasting, and occasionally of *fasting* before Communion. *Nothing* in his works show that he held to Mr. Percival's rigorous idea of what *fasting* must always be.

Mr. Percival himself cites the quotation from S. Gregory Nazienzen given above, on *his* side; not perceiving this, it is clearly against his theory of the universal custom.

This custom found its expression in the first formulated rule of the Church on this subject, in the Council of Hippo, A. D. 393, nine years before S. Augustine wrote to Januarius. Drunkenness and gluttony abounded. Feasts and carousings were held in the Churches, and in the chambers of death and at the tombs of the martyrs. S. Augustine preached before the Council. They did something to correct prevailing excess. The clergy were to be restrained first, and the rule is laid down that the clergy are not to celebrate the Eucharist *after food*; Maundy-Thursday being excepted. *A rule was adopted.* The inference might be drawn that there was no such rule before; or that it was not generally observed; and hence that the custom was not universal. But let this pass. The Canon (28) of Hippo, enjoins:

That the Sacrament of the altar be not celebrated save by *fasting* men; one anniversary being excepted on which the Lord's Supper was instituted. For if the commendatory of any dead persons, whether Bishops or others, must be held in the afternoon, let it be done with prayers only, if those who hold it are found to have dined (or lunched, *pransi inveniuntur*).

The Commendatory was the service for the dying, or the dead, accompanied with Holy Communion. If in the afternoon, and if the priests had dined, there could be no Communion even if the dying or deceased person was a

bishop. Of course, then, if in the *forenoon*, and if the priests *had not taken their prandium*, they could celebrate. They would therefore be the *fasting men*, by whom alone the Sacrament, according to the first part of this Canon, could be celebrated.*

All the Canons of other Councils of that age—small provincial affairs—and in that part of the Church—in Africa, Spain and France for 300 years after Hippo; viz.: Carthage, A. D., 397, 419; Braga, 563, 572; Auxerre, 578; Macon, 585;† Toledo, 646, that have been cited by our opponents, were efforts, desperate efforts at times, to keep the priests from profaning the sacred Mysteries by indecent excesses. "Stuffed with wine," "stuffed with food," are some of the phrases employed in these Canons to indicate the horrible grossness of their habits. One Canon seems to sustain our opponent's claim that they were by it commanded to observe a strict natural fast from midnight, one priest being required to stand by to take up the service if the other faint. And these regulations in little provincial Councils, in rough, revelling times to keep priests in order, are sought for to help to establish the fact of a universal custom based on Apostolic ordering for the whole body of the faithful, priests and people, in the Universal Church in every age and in every clime.

A still further proof of the correctness of our view of

* Since this article was in type we have noticed a singular and strong confirmation of the view here urged, in the Annals of Baronius, written about A. D. 1600. He calls this Canon, one of Carthage A. D. 397, and giving the reason for its passage, says: *Ceterum quoniam diversa erat aliquarum Ecclesiarum consuetudo, passimque post carnem sacrificium offerba uo, cum sustulit in Africa Concilium Carthagineure Tertium, statuens ut a jejuniis semper, excepta die anniversaria Cene Domini, offerretur.* But because the custom of some churches was different, and everywhere the Eucharist was offered *after supper*, the Third Council of Carthage in Africa abolished it, decreeing that it should always, the anniversary of the LORD'S Supper excepted, be offered by *fasting men*. (See Bp. Kingdon, p. 52, note.) The words of this strong champion of the Papacy in the latter part of the 16th century suggest clearly his idea of the custom A. D. 398 and of the evil to be corrected, i. e., Communion *after supper*.

† Mr. Percival, with strange obtuseness, cites the words of this canon: "No Presbyter with a full stomach, or having indulged in wine, shall touch the sacrifice, or presume to celebrate mass; for it is unjust that bodily food shall be preferred to spiritual." Is it not as plain as daylight that what was desired in this Canon was a celebration *before* and not after full feeding? What would be the sense in such a Canon, if the custom the Church, based on Apostolic ruling, was that nobody should celebrate or receive the mysteries, unless for hours, perhaps many hours, he had taken not even the slightest particle of food or drink?

this custom is found in Sozomen and Socrates in the fifth century:

(*Ecc. Hist. Sozomen, Bohn Ed.*, p. 344) "There are several cities and villages in Egypt, where, *contrary to the usages established elsewhere*, the people meet together on Sabbath evenings, and, although they have dined previously, partake of the Mysteries." (*Ecc. Hist. Socrates, Bohn Ed.*, p. 289): "The Egyptians in the neighborhood of Alexandria, and the inhabitants of Thebes * * * do not partake of the Mysteries *in the manner usual among Christians in general*; for after having eaten and satisfied themselves with food of all kinds, in the evening making their oblation they partake of the Mysteries."

The custom in these places in Africa was not the *usual* one. What, then, must the usual or contrary custom have been? Evidently and most simply, *before* they had dined, *before* they had eaten and satisfied themselves, not *after*; and *in the morning*, not in the evening. The usual custom of the Church in England for 300 years, and of the Church in America, is in full accord with all we have yet found of the general custom in S. Augustine's time in Europe, Asia and Africa.

Bear in mind now three things: First, that in times of persecution Christians sometimes met for worship and Holy Communion before day; second, that the custom in S. Augustine's time was *in the morning* instead of *in the evening*, and *before* other food, instead of *after* it; and third, that men were said to be *fasting*, before they had satisfied their appetites, *before* their mid-day meal; or said to be *fasting men* because they kept some ecclesiastical fast, in the way appointed; bear these three things in mind and there is scarcely one argument drawn from any writer down to A. D. 1000, to the effect that the *fasting custom before Eucharist was a rigid, natural fast from the preceding day*, which does not vanish like smoke.*

* Rev. Richard Hall, a curate of S. Augustine's Church, Kilburn, England, published in 1881 *Fasting Reception of the Blessed Sacrament*. We have just looked through the authorities he pleads down to A. D. 1000, some twenty in number. We renew deliberately the assertion made above: "They vanish like smoke." For instance, "No. 9 of the Canons bearing the names of Nicephorous, Patriarch of

In establishing the truth of our fifth proposition, we have established also the fourth and the third, and demonstrated what was the meaning of the first formulated rule, the Canon of Hippo, referred to in our second proposition. We have demonstrated that the early Christian writers did not usually or often mean by the word fasting a rigid natural fast from the beginning of the day. It will not help their cause, therefore, for our opponents to re-iterate the word in a parrot-like way to inculcate their one idea, and to string together quotations containing the word fasting in connection with Holy Communion, from S. Ambrose and Jeremy Taylor, S. Chrysostom and Radbertus, the historians Sozomen and Socrates and the Scotch Presbyterian Dr. Sprott and Cardinal Bona, S. Augustine and Thomas Aquinas, the Monk Anastasius in the sixth, S. Basil in the fourth, Bingham in the last, and Canon Bright and a host of others in the present century, as if they were all clear and independent witnesses for this one idea. Some of them do not mean what they are quoted to prove; and those who do are simply repeaters, we think, of a long-existing mistake. Nor will another reprehensible practice of our opponents help them with thoughtful men. We mean the practice of quoting what Dr. Liddon and Bishop Wordsworth and others say, and say well, against *evening communions*, as if communion in the morning before dinner was as contrary to the general custom of the early Church as communion in the evening and after supper. This reprehensible practice may have hitherto confused some, but our readers now will easily discriminate.

But Mr. Percival has one strong argument that he thinks quite sufficient to establish his case. "Will Dr. Benedict deny that in the year A.D. 1400, every Christian throughout the world recognized the obligation of

Constantinople (A. D. 806) rules, evidently an exception, that the Communion may be given to a sick person who is near death, *although he be not fasting.*" Now, what would be the natural, commonsense meaning of the last clause, which we put in italics? We go to the sick man at ten o'clock at night. Would this rule mean that we may give him the Blessed Sacrament although he may have taken some slight refreshment since the preceding midnight? or that we may administer it even if the nurse has just given the tea, or milk or gruel or wine so frequently imparted to the dying? The last is the more rational idea.

Fasting Communion? I require nothing more to fix my practice." Indeed! A pretty bold avowal for a priest of a Reformed Communion. Let us see. As universally prevalent then, we think, were Mariolatry, Auricular Confession compulsory before Holy Communion, extreme unction as one of the Sacraments of CHRIST, prayers to the Saints, the celibacy of the higher orders of the clergy, Transubstantiation taught and enforced. The Church of England has repudiated that ground, and contends for an appeal to Scripture and the early Church.

It remains, finally, that we should note the one *new* authority for a rigorous fasting communion as the universal custom and rule of the early Church which Mr. Percival has given us. "In his ninth homily to the people of Antioch he (S. Chrysostom) argues that if they eat their breakfast and therefore cannot receive the Holy Communion, yet that there is no reason they should not come and assist at the mass and hear the sermon." Well, we have that homily before us. *Library of the Fathers*. Oxford: John Henry Parker, Hom. IX. We have read it carefully all through. We can find nothing in it that will bear any such construction. But we are glad to be referred to this homily. We will cite a few passages that we do find in § 2. "What hath repelled thee from our table?" A note at bottom says that he means by *our table* the spiritual feast of the oracles of Scripture explained at Church. This is true. S. Chrysostom is not urging people to come to Holy Communion but to the preaching. In this whole sermon he does not mention the Holy Communion once, unless it be in one place where he does use the word *συνάξις*, translated *service*. This word does sometimes mean Holy Communion in S. Chrysostom's writings. Whether it means so *here* let our opponents judge. "When thou hast made up thy mind that after eating and drinking thou must repair also to the *συνάξις*, *service*, thou wilt assuredly be careful of the duty of sobriety. * * * * such use of food and drink as accords with decency;" and then he cautions them against the smell of wine, eructations, etc. We do not think our rigorist will claim this

passage. There is no other place in this homily in which the Holy Communion is mentioned, or so far as we find, even alluded to. Neither do we find the word *breakfast* in the homily, except in this one place in the same section(2). "If I had said, 'Let no one who has breakfasted mix with us,' 'let no one who has eaten be a hearer,' thou wouldst have some kind of excuse." The word for breakfasted is ἡπρωτοχώρας; taken his ἀριστον, not breakfast, but his *prandium*, the mid-day meal. There is a note at the bottom by Rev. Mr. Marriott about Fasting Communion. Why put in is difficult to guess. We can see no reason to imagine S. Chrysostom had any reference to Holy Communion. But if he meant this: "If I had said let no one who has breakfasted mix with us at this spiritual feast of preaching, just as I am accustomed to say let no one who has breakfasted mix with us at the Holy Communion," let it be so. It is a perfectly gratuitous supposition. But let it be so, we say. Then *breakfast is here ἀριστον, the mid-day meal*. For 600 years it had borne this meaning. *ἀρπάζεσθαι* was the word for breakfast.

But there is a foot-note to this homily that we cannot resist quoting. It illustrates and enforces our main argument as to the meaning of *fasting*. "A Canon of Isaac Lingonensis (in the eighth century), forbids anyone to take an oath except *fasting*. The Athenian courts did not sit after sunset, and the great time for forensic business was in the forenoon." The oath was administered to men before dinner (*non pransi*). Here as in the Canon of Hippo, such are spoken of as men *jejuni*, hungry, fasting, waiting for their dinner.

We think in our re-statement we have established our fifth proposition, that fasting did not usually mean in the early centuries what Mr. Percival asserts it did. Perhaps enough has been said to cause him or some other of our antagonists to come out and attempt to disprove our assertions, and so to prevent a book hitherto unanswered, from being hereafter held to be, and by them admitted to be, *unanswerable*.

SAMUEL BENEDICT.

SOME OF THE PRIVATE CHARITIES IN PARIS.

1. *La Charite Privée en Paris*, Par M. MAXIÉE DU CAMP, Académie Française.

2. *Revue des Deux Mondes*, Avril 1, Mai 15, Juillet 1, Aout 1, 1883.

WITH the increase of the population in any country, there always arise two questions to which it is difficult to give satisfactory answers. One is, in what ways can crime be diminished and its evils abated; and the other is, by what methods can suffering and want be relieved without fostering a spirit of pauperism. These are the problems which all social reformers have to meet, and to physicians and clergyman engaged in active work they are questions of serious magnitude. For it may be laid down as an axiom, that vice, crime and misery are always proportionate to the density of the population. As the whole tendency of the age is towards centralization, and the massing of large numbers of people in the cities, especially in those which are manufacturing and commercial points, each year renders the subject of charity more perplexed and involved. To relieve the needy without increasing pauperism; to detect imposture without repelling the actual sufferer; to check the increase of crime, and to lessen the dangers which spring from socialistic teaching, are some of the problems of the present time. It is perfectly true that the State does much by means of the poor fund, reform schools, hospitals and penitentiaries; but still the ugly fact remains that there is much suffering which passes with no relief, much vice that is not restrained, much ignorance which is untaught. To complicate matters still more, the taxes levied for these pur-

poses, and the sad failures of many benevolent and charitable associations, have rendered many people distrustful of any scheme for the relief of suffering or the prevention of crime. In spite of the aid given by municipal and State authorities, in spite of the efforts of the various friendly societies, in spite of the persistent attempts of religious bodies, very little seems to be accomplished. Penitentiaries, hospitals and reformatories are full to overflowing, and the money seems spent, the strength wasted to no purpose. In fact the very number and diversity of charitable methods often cripple their intended usefulness. It is not an infrequent occurrence, to find one family receiving aid from two or three different sources. It is not uncommon to find one man not merely aided, but actually supported by two or three benevolent societies. In spite of all watchfulness and care, there are numbers of idle and vicious persons, who dupe the kindly disposed, and impose upon the benevolent. The very means which are intended to be for the relief of distress are thus made sources of laziness, vice and crime. To remedy this growing evil is the effort of all social reformers, and the question which must be settled is, In what method can religious and benevolent societies assist most the work of the State. For let the State do as much as lies in its power, still it can by no means reach all the different classes. Much work must be done by individuals either singly or in associations, and their efforts should be valuable adjuncts in preserving the peace, the quiet, the morality of the community. It is the part of voluntary societies to stop the sources from which the criminal ranks are recruited. The State enforces the law, and punishes the delinquent and the offender; it is the work of all true charity to see that no additions are made to these classes.

Moved by a sense of the actual necessity of private charity, *i. e.*, charity which in no way is dependent upon municipal aid, but which is supported by voluntary contributions, M. Maxime Du Camp of the French Academy has made a careful study of some of the most important charitable works in Paris. In no way a Christian believer, for he avows, "I am not one of those whom faith

has touched," yet he is not blind to the noble work which is being done in the streets of Paris by private individuals. A writer upon social topics and fully acquainted with his subject, unsolicited he comes to bear his testimony to the manner in which some of the charitable organizations are relieving distress, and diminishing pauperism and crime. His evidence is that of an unbiassed mind; and his statements as to the nature of the various institutions, the means by which they are supported, and the good which they effect, are not the views of a religious champion, but the observation of a shrewd man of the world, who is desirous of lessening the dangers, which menace the peace and the safety of society. Having free access to the archives of the French Academy, his account of the origin and growth of these institutions can be nothing but accurate; while his descriptions of their workings are those of an eyewitness. These facts at once make his statements not merely interesting but also suggestive.

THE LITTLE SISTERS OF THE POOR.

They originated in the village of S. Servan, near S. Malo, on the West of France. Jeanne Jugan, their founder, was a country girl, who had become a house servant, being dissatisfied with farm work. In 1838 her mistress died and Jeanne found herself out of employment. She hired an attic for a room and sought work in the streets; but she was by no means a beggar, for she had saved 600 francs (\$120) from her wages. The winter of 1839 was excessively cold, and as there was no hospital nor infirmary in S. Servan, the poor suffered bitterly. Hearing of one case that was especially piteous Jeanne Jugan had the woman Anne Chauvin removed to her attic. Soon, another case came to her notice, and she had this woman also, Isabel Quem, removed from the hovel in which she was dying by inches, to the friendly attic. The three beds so crowded together that they touched each other, were the beginning of the hospital of the Little Sisters of the Poor, and these three women, Jeanne Jugan, Anne Chauvin and Isabel Quem, the first sisters. By 1841 they had

possession of a new house with twenty sick and bedridden women for inhabitants. The inevitable question of support was now the problem to be solved, and acting under the advice of friends, Jeanne Jugan began to beg. She would accept anything that was given her—old clothes, old shoes, and crusts of bread. But these difficulties only served to make her work known, and friends soon came to her rescue. They bought and furnished a new house and at the same time gave Jeanne a friendly word of caution against attempting too much. She listened attentively to them, but continued in her own path, the work steadily increasing, until, in 1844, the house had sixty-five inmates. In the meantime two young girls who were desirous of becoming sisters had associated themselves with her. These were Virginie Tredainel, Sister Marie Therese, and Marie Catherine Jamet, Sister Marie Augustine; the latter is still living and is superior of the order. The vicar of the parish of S. Servan at that time was a young man of 26 or 27, Le Pailleur, a Breton by race. Possessing all the enthusiasm of his people, he entered heart and soul into the work. He sold his gold watch and private communion service in order to raise the necessary funds. Under his direction the scope of the work was enlarged, and soon a new house was needed, as the present quarters were filled to overflowing. The sum in the treasury was but 50 centimes (.10), a sum hardly large enough to build a new hospital. But they all went to work, and the sisters, under Jeanne Jugan's lead, dug the foundations, and gathered stones from the streets and the fields for the walls. The sight of these women undertaking such a task touched the hearts of the workmen of S. Servan. They proffered their services and soon the hospital was erected. It is almost needless to say that the moving spirit was Father Le Pailleur, who was at once the life of the whole undertaking.

In 1846 Sister Marie Augustine founded a new asylum in Rennes. The house was in a street filled with taverns and saloons, but the result was that in a short time many who had been accustomed to sleep under the tables of the saloons, and at the street corners, came to the asylum

and frequently paid a sou for their lodging. In the same year another house was opened in Dinan, where an old and disused jail was given for the purpose.

In 1849, Father Le Pailleur opened another house in Nantes, and also one in Paris, in the Rue S. Jacques. The work in that city increased so rapidly that soon another hospital was required, which was established in 1851. This was followed by others in 1853, 1854, 1864, so that now, in less than fifty years, the work of caring for aged and helpless mendicants begun by Jeanne Jugan in the attic of S. Servan, has increased to such an extent that in Paris alone there are five hospitals, with 1200 pensioners under the care of 100 sisters. Their only means of support is from the gifts which they receive. No house has any endowment or reserve fund. Each morning two sisters from each house start upon a begging expedition in order to get the food, clothing and other necessities of life. No one turns a deaf ear to their appeal, and even the red republican, ever ready to cry *Clericalisme c'est sennemi*, will reach into his pocket for a sou for "The Little Sisters of the Poor." The hotels and restaurants carefully save all their scraps for them, and a wagon given by one of the omnibus companies collects these fragments, which form no inconsiderable portion of the daily bread of the hospitals. Three meals a day—breakfast, dinner at noon, and tea at five, are thus provided for the 1200 old people, and the scraps which are left are given to the chickens, ducks, pigs and rabbits which are kept for the use of the sick. Laziness finds no encouragement in these hospitals, and those who are not absolutely bedridden ply their trades as best they can. They sort the gifts, repair the clothes, make quilts and spreads of the pieces of cloth, mend the broken furniture. Thrice a week those who are able are taken out to walk, and any sign of drunkenness, any evidence that the liberty has been abused, is punished by depriving the offender of this privilege. Each house is under the care of a superior, who has the entire control, and who keeps an account of the inmates, their age, disease, etc., with a full list of all applicants for admission.

The one object of the sisters is to provide a home for those poor people who have been unfortunate in life, or who have been thrust out of doors on the plea that "Old age is good for nothing; it consumes and does not produce."

THE LADIES OF CALVARY.

Of a totally different character is the work carried on by The Ladies of Calvary. In no sense a religious society, they compose a voluntary association. As M. Du Camp says, "No vow enchains them; no costume distinguishes them; they belong to the world which they have never left. They have their patients in the infirmary, it is true, but they have also their children at home, their relatives, their pleasures, their duties in society. If they consecrate a portion of their time to the relief of incurables, if they voluntarily abandon the refinements of life in order to dress cancers and wash running sores, it is owing to the pleasure which they have in obeying the dictates of their faith." The organization is a recent one, having been begun at Lyons in 1834, and the hospital in Paris was not established until 1874. A notice of this work is especially valuable, not merely in order to understand its methods, but also from the fact that the society is a voluntary body differing materially from the organization of all sisterhoods. It had its origin in the activity, the impetuosity and the zeal of Madame Jeanne Françoise Garnier. Left a widow at the age of 23 with no children, and possessing an income of 1,200 francs (\$250) she sought for occupation in charitable works. In a city like Lyons, especially during this period, the reign of Louis Philippe, sick, poor, suffering, were not difficult to find. One day in the course of her rounds she was told of a woman whose condition was so frightful that no one could enter the room. In a filthy attic on a pile of rags Madame Garnier found the poor wretch dying of leprosy. At once she began to alleviate her misery by cleaning the room, washing the sufferer, and arranging a more comfortable bed. But the air was so fetid, and the odor so horrible, that more than once she was compelled to leave the room

for a breath of fresh air. When she had succeeded in partially improving the woman's condition, she endeavored to obtain some more comfortable place, where she could die in peace. The priest, who came in response to her summons, never passed the threshold. The sight was so terrible, and the odor so poisonous, that he could not muster enough courage to enter. The consequence was that no hospital would open its doors to receive the sufferer, and her misery was soon terminated by death.

This occurrence opened a new field of work for Madame Garnier. How many more were there like this woman whom no hospital would receive? How many incurables were there in Lyons in wretched attics and filthy hovels with no means of relief? How many might be lingering in the agonies of leprosy, cancer, and other similar diseases? With all speed she resolved to establish a hospital, where such patients could be received and attended by widows like herself. She soon found a young girl who had been terribly burned, and two women dying of cancer. A room was hired, and with the aid of two other widows the work was fairly inaugurated. But the applications for entrance were so numerous that soon other apartments were needed. With perfect confidence of success Madame Garnier started to beg for aid and explain her object. Of course there was the usual result; some laughed at her as visionary, others were incredulous, others still rudely refused to listen to her story. By some means, however, the account of her efforts came to the ears of Cardinal De Bonald, then Archbishop of Lyons. He espoused her cause, threw all his influence on her side, and in a short time she was able to hire a little house to which all the patients were removed on May 3d, 1843. But so hideous and loathsome was the burnt girl Marie, that the coachman flatly refused to carry her, and Mad. Garnier was obliged to bear her to the new home on her shoulders through the streets.

Success was now assured, and the number of applicants, as well of widows associated in the work, increased so rapidly that, in 1845, another and a larger house was required. Here the organization was perfected and by

Mad. Garnier's influence the rules for its future guidance were adopted. There were to be four classes of persons in the society: First, the widows who came to the hospital to nurse the sick; second, the widows who lived there and gave their entire time to the work; third, the widows who sought to increase the resources by seeking aid in house to house visitation; fourth, the lady associates who paid an annual subscription of not less than twenty francs (\$4).

For eight years, "The Ladies of Calvary" occupied the house at the Roman Baths in the suburbs of Lyons, but the extent of their operations became so enlarged that it was absolutely necessary to find a more suitable place. In 1853, an old chateau near Fourvieres just outside of Lyons was obtained and thither the hospital transferred. The money for its purchase was raised principally through the efforts of Madame Garnier, who by persistent entreaty had persuaded the owner to reduce his price 30,000 francs (\$6,000). Nearly all the money was gotten by her begging, and the balance unpaid was secured by notes and mortgages. But no constitution could endure such a strain, and in Dec., 1853, five months after she had seen her work an undoubted success, Madame Garnier died. To have planned such an enterprise was a noble thing, but to begin it with no other resources than \$250 income and carry it to perfection in less than fifteen years is stupendous.

The work in Paris was not started until 1874, when in the midst of the desolation caused by the Franco-Prussian war and the Commune, Madame Lechart and four other widows opened a cancer hospital in a building which had been erected for a school. The parlor and class-rooms were made the wards, containing twelve beds. Madame Lechart and her companions slept in the attic, and an out-house served for the morgue. By the end of a year the number of lady associates had increased from five to 246. By 1880, they were able to purchase a large plot of ground when a new hospital was built. The money was raised as usual through the charity of the Parisians, and there are many anecdotes of their generosity. One lady

sold her diamonds; another wore woollen dresses for two winters, others stinted themselves in toilet luxuries and household furniture, while others gave their rings and bracelets. The hospital is situated at the end of a large garden and so arranged as to admit plenty of sunshine and fresh air. The halls are broad and spacious, so as to cause no inconvenience to the sufferers by the constant passing to and fro. On the first floor are the drug store and the lavatories opening into the ward containing twenty beds, with several rooms for private patients. In the second story everything is of a temporary nature, and the walls and partitions are of wood which can easily be removed when it becomes necessary to enlarge the building. Here at present are the rooms of the widows neatly furnished, bright and cheerful, in most marked contrast to the dungeon like cells of a convent. On the third floor are the rooms of the servants, mostly young girls who are willing to aid in the nursing without receiving any wages. In the cellar are the furnaces, kitchen, store-rooms, and dining-room. In 1883, there were twenty beds for the reception of patients, and many came to the hospital for treatment who lived at home. All the nursing is done by The Ladies of Calvary under the direction of Dr. Eugene LeGrand, the house surgeon. Many of them are of noble birth. Many are known in society for their accomplishments. But they come every morning to dress the wounds and minister to the sufferers amidst all the horrors of a cancer hospital. What they are, the frightful sights, the horrible odor, the dire sufferings of mind and body, cannot be realized until one has passed through the wards. And when these ladies are seen bending over the bed of a cancer patient removing the soiled bandages, washing the sore, and applying fresh lint without shrinking in the least, without displaying the horror or disgust, it is possible to understand how much they are devoted to their calling. Few nurses are fond of attending cancer patients, but that is the work which these ladies perform. The previous evening they may have been at the theatre, the opera, or some party, but in the morning they come to the hospi-

tal, many of them in their carriages. After a short service in the chapel, each goes about her task obeying implicitly Dr. LeGrand's orders. At nine A. M. and five P. M. the bandages are changed and the sores dressed. In the meantime they attend to the patients' wants, see that the out-patients are cared for, and do the horrid and filthy work of sorting and packing the soiled compresses for the laundry, to save, if possible, some of the linen. That comprises the day's work, and the only stringent rules are the fact of widowhood and obedience to the head of the house. It is certainly a noble charity and may furnish some suggestions to the voluntary associations in this country.

THE HOSPITALLERS OF S. JEAN DE DIEU.

A much more ancient charity is that of "The Hospitaliers of S. Jean de Dieu," the descendants of the Portuguese Jean Ciudad. Born in 1495, he was first a shepherd boy and then a soldier in the Spanish army, when he came very near being hung for stealing. Disgusted with military life he returned to the care of cattle, which he soon forsook for the more congenial task of selling images and catechisms in order to raise money enough to carry him to Tunis and Algiers to rescue Christian slaves. At that time Jean D'Avila, a Dominican preacher, was at the height of his reputation, and Jean Ciudad was so much moved by his eloquence, that he was seized with a paroxysm of religious fervor. He confessed his sins in a loud voice, tore his beard, rolled in the dirt, pulled off his clothes, distributed gratuitously his catechisms and images, and gave his money, furniture and clothes to any who happened to be near. How much of this was genuine devotion, how much temporary insanity, is a question difficult to settle. But Jean Ciudad was regularly exorcised for demoniacal possession, and after some time was discharged from Grenada perfectly cured. At once he undertook a pilgrimage to the shrine of Our Lady of Guadalupe, in the midst of winter, barefooted, without food or money. On the road he had visions of

the Blessed Virgin with the infant Jesus in her arms naked, but holding the clothes in which he was to be dressed. This was a sign that he, Jean Ciudad, should have pity upon the weak, recover the abandoned, and clothe the poor. Satisfied that he had now found his vocation he returned to Grenada, where he sold firewood instead of catechisms. With the money gained in this way, he searched the lanes and alleys for the sick and poor. One day he found a house for rent, which he managed to obtain through the help of some friends who had confidence in him. A priest gave him the necessary furniture, and soon Jean Ciudad, with forty-six lame and dying beggars, was installed in his first hospital. This was in 1540 when he was forty-five years of age. The means of support were gained by his desperate entreaties at the doors of houses, which he besieged every evening with the plaintive cry, "For the love of God, do good my brethren." This he explained by saying, "Do good to those who suffer, it is to do good to yourselves." So successful were his requests, that he was able to enlarge his house, substitute beds for the rush mats upon which the sick lay, and provide separate cots for each. This may seem a mere trifle, but when it is remembered that it was customary to put two and even more patients in the same bed, and that as late as 1785 Tenon found in the Hôtel de Dieu, in Paris, 1,200 beds, containing 3,418 patients, Jean Ciudad showed himself a reformer two centuries and a half in advance of his age. Companions soon flocked around him, and alms flowed in such steady streams, that he was able to enlarge the scope of his labors, which embraced Grenada, Andalusia, and Castille. He may be said to be the founder of the modern hospital, for one of his plans was to separate the various diseases of fever, small-pox, insanity, and others, which up to this time had been huddled in one room. In addition, he founded the first work house, by providing a place where beggars and tramps might sleep. Of course his fame was wide-spread and he was known as "The father of the poor," a fact which he was not slow in utilizing. For all this it is easy to pardon his asceticism, which rivalled that

of any flagellant, and which helped materially to shorten his life. In 1550 he died from the result of his labors combined with his austerities, after having committed his work to the charge of Antonio Martin, his first disciple. But no hindrance was caused by his decease. Though men had laughed at him as crazy, yet after his death they recognized the greatness of his benefactions. All were ready to aid in the movement which he had inaugurated, and hospitals were built by royal bounty, as well as by private means, in Madrid, Grenada, Florence and Paris. His name was heard through France and Italy. Lope de Vega composed a sonnet in his honor. Murillo painted a picture of one of his miracles. Even the Popes condescended to notice him. Pius V. appointed the dress of the brotherhood, Urban VIII. beatified him, and Innocent XII. canonized him.

The hospital, which Marie de Medicis had built in Paris, was closed in 1790 by the decree of the Assembly, and there was no house of the brothers in France, until 1818, when the work which had stopped for so long was revived by Captain Magolon of the French army. During the wars of Napoleon he had been obliged to shoot a German soldier who had deserted to the allied forces, but who had been recaptured. The memory of that event could never be effaced, and after the battle of Waterloo he resolved to devote his life to works of charity in expiation of his sin. He had had much experience in the hospitals during the war, and knew what ravages typhus fever had made among the sick and wounded. He entered a hospital, passed the time of his novitiate, and revived in France the work of the brotherhood. In 1819, with twelve volunteers as nurses, he began work in the hospitals and prisons at Marseilles. In 1823 Lyons was made the centre of their operations; and the same year another house was opened in Lommelet, near Lille. This was followed in 1826 by another at Dinan; in 1833 by one at S. Servan; and in 1842 by one in Paris in the Rue Oudinot. Here all are received with no restriction as to race or religion. They are free to employ any physician they may choose, and the nursing is done by

the brothers. In addition to this establishment, there is another house of the Hospitallers of S. Jean de Dieu, near Grenelle, in the suburbs of Paris, for abandoned, imbecile and deformed children. This was started in 1858 by five brothers with two waifs whom they had found. From that time to 1870 there was a steady increase of patients. But in the siege of Paris, the house, which was built rather imperfectly, was so badly shaken by the concussions of the artillery, that there was great danger of its tumbling down. After much deliberation it was decided to tear down the dangerous portion and rebuild. One of the brothers had some knowledge of architecture and building. He drew the plans, dug the trenches, and laid the foundations. There could be no possibility of failure to any such indomitable will, and in 1875 the house was completed and opened to receive 260 children. It is perhaps well to say here that the brothers could never have succeeded, had they not been aided by their friends. One of the greatest means of assistance was "The Council of Administration," a body of French gentlemen who formed a large association. They gave a great deal of time and thought to the subject and their purses were always open to every appeal. Even during the stormy times of the Commune friends appeared in the most unexpected quarter, and when all Paris was threatened with famine, the delegate of Vaugirard, Arrondissement XVI. and Victor Clement, a dyer, furnished the hospital with salt meat, bread and dried vegetables.

This house is open to all children between the ages of five and six, except those afflicted with epilepsy and idiocy. A stipend, the maximum of which is fifty centimes (.10) a day, and the minimum ten sous a month is collected, if the children's parents are not hopelessly poor. This goes to pay the daily expenses, which are met in the much same manner as those of "The Little Sisters of the Poor." In addition there is connected with the hospital, a chicken yard, a stable containing four cows, a kitchen garden and diminutive brewery, where a beer specially strong of hops is made for the scrofulous and rickety

children. The whole aspect of the house shows that great attention has been paid to the laws of hygiene; wide halls, roomy stairways, large dormitories with windows opening upon the gardens, a bath-room with a tile floor, and a cloister for exercise on rainy days, are strong evidence of the brothers' skill and knowledge. The children are given four meals a day, breakfast of soup, early dinner of meat and vegetables, a lunch of bread, and supper of soup and vegetables. In case, however, any child requires a stronger diet, meat is given with every meal. As far as possible the children are taught reading, writing, arithmetic, grammar and history. Their weaknesses and deformities necessarily limit the trades which they can learn and those only are followed which do not tax the strength, such as tailoring, shoemaking and the manufacture of brushes. Connected with the hospital is a brush factory, which is leased to a dealer, and brings in 1,000 francs (\$200) a year income. Formerly all the pupils were discharged at eighteen, and provided for by the state. But since that appropriation has for some reason been cut off, many of the children have been flung back upon the brothers' hands, and their hospital being already full, they can receive no new pupils, and must necessarily discontinue their work.

THE ORPHANAGE OF APPRENTICES AT ANTEUIL.

Another institution of a similar character is the Orphanage of Apprentices, founded by Abbé Roussel in 1865, for the instruction of the gamins of the street. Like all other charities its origin was of the humblest kind. One winter night Abbé Roussel saw a miserable urchin rummaging in a pile of ordure. "What are you doing?" he asked. The boy replied, "I am looking for something to eat." He at once took him to his rooms, and provided for his needs. From this occurrence sprang the Orphanage of Apprentices. The Abbé began to think that there must be many others in Paris like this boy, and in a short time six were living in his room fed and clothed by himself. If he could now find

a house, there was an opportunity of doing a noble work, by gathering these neglected and deserted lads, instructing them and giving them a home, and so prevent their growing up into pickpockets, thieves and burglars. An old building more like a hovel than a house was discovered one day in the Rue du Fontaine, Anteuil. There was nothing prepossessing about the place. It stood at the end of an avenue of ragged poplars in a wilderness of thistles and wild chicory. The roof had fallen in, and there was not a pane of glass in the house. Nothing daunted, Abbé Roussel begged the money, bought the old place, and in 1866 began his task under the title of "The Work of the First Communion." The money needed was furnished through bequests, gifts and the truly French method, lotteries.

In 1872 most of the trades were at a standstill for the want of skilled workmen. The Franco-Prussian war, the Commune, and lastly the exiling of many, had sadly depleted the ranks. Abbé Roussel saw his chance. If he could enlarge the scope of his labors, and teach the boys trades, he could keep them with him until they were eighteen or twenty years of age, and then they could go into the world skilled workmen. The first attempt was made in the establishment of a shoemaker's shop. This was so successful that other buildings were erected, and it became the nucleus of a group of shops, where the boys were taught the trades of carpenters, locksmiths, moulders, tailors, and bookbinders. How he ever found the money will always be a mystery. As M. Du Camp says, "God alone will ever know of his devotion and faith." He resorted to every expedient, and even borrowed large sums, giving notes in payment, perfectly confident that in some way he would be able to meet his liabilities. In 1878 a ray of comfort was given him, when he received from the French Academy a prize of 2,000 francs, (\$400) as a reward of merit. But this sum did not go far towards paying the 200,000 francs (\$40,000), which were his actual debts at the time. Unless some assistance was rendered him the whole work must be abandoned. The aid came from the most unexpected

quarter. Villemessant was at that time the editor of the *Figaro* newspaper, and his sympathies were aroused in behalf of Abbé Roussel. A subscription list, which recited the objects and the needs of the work, was opened in the columns of his paper, and in less than a week 330,000 francs (\$66,000), had been collected.

In brief this is the history of this remarkable charity, which aims to diminish crime by stopping the sources from which the criminal class are recruited. It serves the same purposes as reform farms and industrial schools, without leaving that ineffaceable stigma upon the life. It only now remains to give a short description of the Orphanage, with its house and shops.

The building strongly resembles a barracks, and there is a manifest absence of luxury. Everything which will conduce to cleanliness is apparent—wooden walls, plaster ceilings, whitewash and plenty of light and air. The boys with their hair cropped short are dressed in linen trousers and shirts, with strong shoes on their feet. They can roll in the sand as much as they please, and the dreaded words, "Take care you don't tear your clothes," are never heard. On the contrary, the greatest liberty is given them, and they are allowed to run, jump and climb, with not a word of reproof. A good gymnasium is provided for them, and the only restriction is regarding the number who can enter at one time. For it is one of Abbé Roussel's principles that bodily fatigue is a safeguard against immorality and vice, and his boys are encouraged in their plays and sports. Hardly more than an hour at a time is given to study, for it would be impossible to keep their attention for a much longer period, and the frequent intermissions for play and exercise not only prevent their minds from stagnating, but also make the instruction more permanent. The whole rule of the house is that of kindness. As Abbé Roussel says, "No one is obliged to stay here," and he seems to be more of a companion to his boys than the head of a large school. Among the inmates are found street urchins of Paris, boys from the provinces, Belgians, Brazilians, and even negroes. Many of them are or-

phans. Others have been turned out of doors by heartless parents. Others have been picked up in the streets, the father in prison, and the mother cohabiting with some other man. Some of the boys were sent by the police, who prefer the Orphanage to the House of Correction. Others have been found hanging around the cheap theatres and low saloons. Others have come of their own accord and asked for shelter; while others on account of the inability of their parents to control them have been sent to the Abbé for training. For the last class a nominal charge of from ten to twenty francs a month is made, to help pay for their living and instruction.

All are taught reading, writing, arithmetic, the catechism and some trade. The strongest boys, and those who come from the country are instructed in farming; hedging, ditching, grafting, the trimming of trees, the differences of soils, and the rotation of crops are the subjects which they learn. Others are made shoemakers and they still provide the "Sisters Calvary" with all the shoes required in their hospital. In the various buildings are found the tailors sitting crosslegged with shears and needle in hand; the carpenters busy with plane and hammer and saw, the locksmiths with file and chisel and drill, the skill of the moulders furnishes many of the statues of the saints, which adorn the country churchyards, while in the kitchen others are busy peeling potatoes, slicing carrots, and performing other culinary operations. There is also connected with the Orphanage, a printing establishment, to which are annexed a type foundry and a bookbindery. Two papers, *La France illustrée* and *L'Ami des Enfants*, are published there, the work being done by the boys, and their sale aids materially in raising the money for the necessary expenses.

This is always a perplexing question, and though in 1882 the cost of each pupil had been brought down to one franc, seventy-seven centimes (about .35) a day, yet at the end of the year there was a deficit of 87,000 francs (\$17,400). This was met by gifts, bequests,

charity sermons, and last but not least, fairs and bazaars. The work is not yet self supporting, though the sale of the products of the workshops has been sufficient to cover the cost of the material used, and to pay the salaries of the instructors. The number of apprentices has steadily risen, until in 1882 there were no less than three hundred boys at the Orphanage being clothed, lodged, fed and taught. The entire number since 1865, the year of the inception of the work, has been 6,000. Of them, about eighty per cent. have become sober and honest workmen; the other twenty per cent. have returned to the streets. This may seem a large proportion, but when the facts are considered, the former associations, the previous evil influences at home and in the streets, to say nothing of hereditary traits, the loss is small. The effort of Abbé Roussel is a new departure in charitable work, and if his Orphanage can be placed upon a permanent self-sustaining basis, it may do much to solve some of the problems, which are such a burden to society.

The few charities, whose origin and growth have been related, furnish excellent instances of the method in which any institution must be managed if it would gain the confidence of the public. None of these, neither the Little Sisters of the Poor nor the Ladies of Calvary, nor the Hospitallers of S. John, nor the Orphanage of Apprentices, was the result of chance. Its origin was not in that vague idea of sympathy and charity, which leads so many well disposed persons to start out upon missions of mercy with no sharply defined purpose in view. Nor was its growth and prosperity merely the result of good luck and favorable circumstances. But underlying the whole work there were certain principles and aims which were clearly visible to all; there were certain rules for the government of the institution, which were business-like, if not good common-sense. Though at times the founders may have been almost discouraged by the enormity of their efforts and the difficulties with which they were surrounded, yet the firm adherence to their principles always extricated them from their entangle-

ments, and made the path which they were to follow plain and distinct. Unless there had been this spirit dominating the whole enterprise, it would undoubtedly have been a dismal failure, the originators would soon have been discouraged by the rebuffs with which they met, and the people to whom they appealed would have grown weary of their importunities and refused their assistance. But the very fact that they know well and accurately what they are desirous of accomplishing, gave them confidence in themselves, and at the same time removed distrust from those to whom they appealed. When asked what was the object of their work, they could give a prompt and concise answer, which left a definite impression upon the mind of the questioner. In plain English, they concentrated all their efforts upon the accomplishment of one certain work. They did not endeavor to do a half dozen things at once, and so, by diffusing their energy, waste opportunity, time and means, but each person, Jeanne, Jugan, Madame Garnier, Jean Ciudad, Abbé Roussel, was endeavoring to reach a certain class in the community. That was the special work undertaken, and the other branches of charitable work were left for other associations and individuals. This does not imply that they were callous to the needs of others, but it was simply the application of the well-known maxim, "A person can not do two things at once;" and the result was that those who contributed money to aid the work were absolutely certain that it would be spent for one purpose alone, and not scattered in three or four different directions, and so be practically wasted. If their work was a hospital, it was governed by hospital rules. If it was merely a home, then there was always some one person who was the head of the house. If it was a school, it was under the direction of a master, and managed as a school should be. This was the foundation of all their success and it can be laid down as the first essential to success in any charitable institution, that it should have a definite object in view, and aim at relieving or lessening one special form of evil or suffering in the community.

In the second place it is indispensable to the institution, that it should be under the direction of one person, who would be everywhere recognized as the head, and whose word and authority could not be gainsaid. As long as Madame Garnier lived she was the ruling spirit of the Ladies of Calvary. Her influence was felt on every side, and her directions were implicitly obeyed. Before he died, Jean Ciudad committed the care of his work to Antonio Martin, and his authority was unimpeached. But this was only the application of the true business principle, that there should be a head to every undertaking. Even in the stock companies which are organized on the broadest basis, the president is always recognized as the superior officer. He may be under the control of a board of directors, but he is their mouthpiece if nothing more. All their orders come through him, and the employees recognize him as the one to whom they must look for directions. Any factory, any shop, any bank, any insurance company, in which each director could come in and order the clerks to do as he felt inclined, would very soon be in inextricable confusion, and compelled to close its doors. And any charity in which there is more than one head, will very soon find itself involved in a conflict of authorities, which will hamper seriously, if not retard entirely its progress. To be successful, and to win the confidence of people, there must be a recognized head in every charitable institution, no matter how humble it may be. There must be one ruling spirit, whose authority should be recognized without, as well as within the institution. There may be, and no doubt there ought to be, a council of directors, a board of assistants, or some other like association, but the members of that board should under no circumstances be allowed to direct the affairs of the hospital, the school, or the home. Their office should be to raise the funds for the support, to provide the necessary sustenance, to see that all the means which any exigency should demand were forthcoming. They not only should be allowed, but made to understand that when their opinion was asked for at a board meeting they should express themselves

freely and without reserve. Their resolutions should come through the president, who should be the official mouthpiece of the board. But to require that the directors should enter the hospital, and give the nurses and the patients the benefit of their own ideas, prescribe remedies which the physician has not ordered, countermand or override his directions, reverse the orders of the president, and generally set things to right in their own opinion can only have one result—confusion worse confounded. Yet this is the very rock upon which so many well-planned and excellently intentioned charities have been wrecked. Partly to increase the interest of the people, partly to lighten the load, there has always been a board of managers, sometimes self-appointed, sometimes representing others. But the result has been the same in both cases—the detriment of the work. Physicians are very loth to have their orders disregarded, especially when they give their services. Nurses are pretty apt to make mistakes when the doctors' directions are countermanded by some manager, who happens to be making his or her rounds. A house is generally sure to remain in a state of disorder, where one manager is succeeded by another, and both consider it their duty to arrange matters to suit their own taste. And the public at large are very apt to laugh scornfully at the whole arrangement of any such charity, and be rather unwilling to aid its work. It is this cause, more than any other, which damages the chances of many voluntary charities, and it can be stated without any fear of contradiction, that any charitable institution, be it hospital or school, or home, which is supported with difficulty, and has not the confidence of the public, owes most of its ill success to this source. It is an old saying that "Too many cooks spoil the broth," and in many of the charitable and benevolent societies there are too many heads for any lasting good. Charity must be put on a business basis if it is ever going to succeed, and in all these French charities, it is easy to find the authority which controls and directs. They are in marked contrast to some of our American institutions which are vaguely impersonal, or

have as many heads as the fabled hydra, and it would be well to copy them in this respect at least. Let the president of every charitable society be the president, and let all orders for the management, all directions about permits of entrance come from him or her as the case may be. The board of managers or directors would find enough and more than enough to do, in counselling with the president, and finding "the sinews of war." If there is a house surgeon, let his word upon the subject of the patients be law, and have the head nurse under the orders of the president and the surgeon alone. This would prevent any possibility of confusion; it would destroy completely all chances of a conflict of authority; it would bring things upon a working basis, and systematize and divide the work. The duties of the board would be clearly defined, the president would have the support and aid which he required; the doctor would never have to complain that the patient suffered from the neglect, or the disregard of his orders; the nurse would never be in that most unenviable of all positions, not knowing which to obey, and afraid of disobeying either manager or physician; and lastly, the public would feel a pride as well as a confidence in such an institution. They would be more willing to aid the labors of its adherents, and more disposed to put it on a self-supporting, independent basis.

NOTE.—Since the above was written there has appeared an article in the *British Quarterly* for January 1884, by B. Benford Rawlings, entitled "Lay and Medical Functions in Hospital Administrations." The conclusions arrived at are the same as those of this, though proceeding from a different standpoint.

GEORGE WILLIAM LINCOLN.



